

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

Editor : DOM BEDE WINSLOW

Associate Editor : DONALD ATTWATER

CONTENTS

pages

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----|---|----------------------|-----|
| THE DEFINITION OF THE ASSUMPTION OF OUR LADY | | | | | |
| | <i>Dom Thomas Rigby, D.D.</i> | 117 | | | |
| THE PRAYER TO JESUS | - | - | - | <i>E. Behr-Sigel</i> | 132 |
| THE DIVINE OFFICE IN THE BYZANTINE RITE—I | | | | | |
| | <i>D. C. McPherson</i> | 151 | | | |
| CHRONICLE OF EVENTS | - | - | - | - | 158 |
| OBITUARY | - | - | - | - | 190 |
| NEWS AND COMMENTS | - | - | - | - | 192 |
| REVIEW OF REVIEWS | - | - | - | - | 194 |
| LETTER TO THE EDITOR | - | - | - | - | 195 |
| RECENT PUBLICATIONS | - | - | - | - | 197 |

SINGLE COPIES 2/- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION 8/- POST FREE
U.S.A. AND CANADA 2 dollars

London Agents : Geo E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square,
Holborn, London, W.C.1, to whom all subscriptions are
to be paid, except those from U.S.A.

U.S.A. Agents : The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare
Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review
should be addressed to the Editor, E.C.Q., St. Augustine's
Abbey, Ramsgate.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

*(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)*

VOL. VII

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1947

No. 3

THE DEFINITION OF THE ASSUMPTION OF OUR LADY

AT the present time many Catholics are earnestly petitioning the Holy See to define as an article of the Faith the corporal Assumption of Our Lady into heaven shortly after her death: all Catholics, they point out, of every rite, hold this truth most firmly and they consider that its definition will redound in an eminent way to the glory of God and the honour of His holy Mother. On the other hand other Catholics, equally loyal to the Faith and devoted to our Lady, maintain that this truth is not definable in so far as it is not contained, at least explicitly, in the Sacred Scriptures or the primitive apostolic tradition. Others again maintain that it is clear from the history of theological development that solemn definitions of the teaching of the Church are usually made for the suppression of growing errors or the termination of serious disputes; but since at the present time no controversy has arisen over the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, its definition—they would assert—cannot be said to be necessary in the least, nor is its definition expedient for it would be a new stumbling block, hindering those who would return to the Church from heresy or unbelief. The questions therefore present themselves to the Catholic theologian: (1) what are the historical and theological arguments on which the truth of the Assumption of Our Lady is based; (2) what theological "note" is to be given to this truth; (3) what should we say of the definability of this truth and what should we think of the opinions briefly outlined above?

I

For the writer there is one and only one sufficient argument for the truth of the Assumption of Our Lady : it is the common belief and teaching of the Catholic Church in her magisterium ordinarium, exercised throughout the world, by bishops in communion with the Holy See, and by pastors and catechists deputed by them. That argument is to his mind entirely satisfactory and is alone convincing. For the Church was sent by God to teach the truth ; the Church throughout the world, with a marvellous unanimity teaches the Assumption of Our Lady ; therefore that doctrine is true.

Unfortunately this is too simple a line of argument for many theologians, so they produce other arguments which can be found expounded at length in all the "approved authors" and which can be grouped under the headings of arguments from Scripture, from the ancient liturgical books, from the writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and from the history of the doctrine. Considerations *ex ratione theologica* are customarily produced in support, but as these are admittedly suasive only drawing their validity from the congruence of the doctrine with other manifestations of God's goodness and mercy to man, we can hardly call them arguments on which the truth of the doctrine is based and we omit them from this short study.

(a) From the Sacred Scriptures a number of Marian texts are commonly quoted : in the first place Gen. iii, 15, "Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, inter semen tuum et semen illius." Clearly this text goes no way of itself towards proving the Assumption of Our Lady. Approved authors usually argue therefore that we may deduce from this text that whatever is a consequence of sin should be subjected to her who so completely conquered the devil and his offspring, sin. Now death and corruption are a consequence of sin, therefore death and corruption should be made subject to Our Blessed Lady, which can only mean that she was taken from death and corruption by corporeal assumption into heaven. Thus Dom L. Janssens, O.S.B.,¹ who claims that Andrew of Crete² (A.D. 680-720) anticipated this reading of the text.

Another text quoted in this connexion is Luke i, 28 : "Ave, gratia plena, Dominus tecum, benedicta tu in mulieri-

¹ *Summa Theologica*, Vol. V, p. 945.

² P.G. 97, 1079, sq.

bus" which is developed in the words of Alexander II :¹ "She passed over (from this life) without corruption according to the Angel's word, or rather God's word by the Angel, that she should be proved full of grace, not half full." Again the Virgin's glory is said to be described prophetically in Psalm xlv, 10 : "Adstitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate"—a glory of body as well as of soul ; but during her earthly life Mary received no bodily glorification, it seems therefore reasonable to suppose that this was conferred on her immediately after death. This is supported by the Apocalypse xii, 1 : "Signum magnum apparuit in caelo ; mulier amicta sole et luna sub pedibus ejus, et circa caput ejus corona stellarum duodecim," for thus did John envisage the bodily glory of his Mother after her departure from the world.

It is hardly necessary to point out that these interpretations of the texts are—may we say—far-fetched. They *may* bear this meaning, but surely not at first glance ; nor surely so certainly as to form a solid scriptural basis for any doctrine. Certainly if the British Israelites or the "Great Pyramid" cranks used their authorities with such poetic license, their opponents would justly profess themselves unconvinced of the doctrines based on such authority.

(b) From the ancient liturgical books, the oldest testimonies of the feast of the Assumption date back to the Gelasian sacramentary where in an offertory prayer we read : "Ad tua preaconia recurrit ad laudem quod vere talis (sc. Maria) assumpta est."² The Gregorian Sacramentary is even clearer : "Veneranda nobis, Domine, hujus est diei festivitas in qua Dei Genetrix mortem subiit, nec tamen mortis nexibus deprimi potuit quae filium tuum genuit incarnatum."³ Now although it is admitted that this historic collection does not date from the time of St. Gregory the Great, it remains true that St. Gregory did indeed interest himself in this sort of research and reform and that his aim was both to preserve the purity of the Faith and the most ancient tradition of the liturgy. Further the Gregorian collection was intended to enshrine—and for the most part did so—the work of Gregory. So it is not unreasonable to suppose that the feast of the Assumption was known at the latest early in the seventh

¹ Quoted by Janssens, p. 945.

² P.L. 74 1174.

³ P.L. 79, 133.

century at Rome, and when Pope Sergius (687-707) established a procession in Rome for the commemoration of the "Dormition" of our Lady, the feast was already old.

The texts soon become quite explicit: thus the Gallico-Gothic sacramentary and the Mozarabic Missal both contain Masses for this feast: "sacramentum praeonabile et . . . inter homines singulare assumptione virginis; illa hodie inter angelorum virginumque choros meruit assumi"; and the Ambrosian rite is quoted by Janssens in the following terms: "Beata Dei Genetrix intermerata Virgo Maria gloriosissime fulget, cujus assumptionis diem omni devotione colendum, praesenti sacrificio celebremus." We learn from St. Gregory of Tours that already in his day the feast was celebrated in Gaul with great solemnity by order of a synod at Rheims; a synod at Salzburg in Germany under Boniface in 713 and at Cloveshoe in England in 747 imposing the feast show how the doctrine was accepted in our own country in those days. In 858 Pope Nicholas IV ordered the Bulgarians to fast on the vigil of the feast, which had been extended with an octave to the whole Roman Church as of obligation by Pope Leo IV in 847.

Nor was this an "invention" of the Roman Church. Nicephorus Callistus tells us that the Emperor Maurice (582-602) directed the feast to be celebrated in the Orient on 15th August, which does not imply that the feast was unknown before that date! In fact, it appears, according to Baumstark¹ a feast "to the memory of the Holy Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary" was celebrated in the Christian East as early as the end of the fourth century, but as there is no explicit mention of the Assumption—or "Dormitio"—it cannot be cited as the first reference to this doctrine.

Certainly before the era of the great schisms which divided East from West, the Feast was universally established for to this day all the Oriental liturgies: Byzantine, Jacobite, Coptic and Armenian commemorate it with no little splendour. In 1342 an Armenian synod declares: "It is to be known that the Armenian Church believes and hold that the Holy Mother of God was taken up bodily into heaven by the power of Christ"; and another Armenian synod summoned to Jerusalem in 1672 to combat Calvinism confirmed that teaching. Abbot Cabrol in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* sums up his findings thus: "Le fait que, à la fin du VI^e siècle, l'Assomption est célébrée solennellement en Orient

¹ (*Römische Quartalschrift*, 1897, pp. 55-6, quoted by Bellamy in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* II, 2130.

et Occident, nous permet de remonter pour son institution jusqu'au commencement de ce siècle ou même à la fin du Ve. Quant à l'origine même il semble assez vraisemblable que le fête prit naissance auprès du tombeau de la Vièrge à Gethsemani, à la suite des pèlerinages que conduisaient les fidèles en ce lieu."

(c) Testimonies from the writings of the ancient Fathers which were commonly cited in an uncritical age have been severely curtailed in the last century. The most ancient authentic writer who clearly refers to the belief would seem to be St. Gregory of Tours (538-94) in his *De Gloria Martyrum*: "Now when Mary, having run the course of this life, was being summoned from the world, all the apostles were gathered together from their various spheres of mission to her house. And when they had heard she was to be taken up from this life, they kept watch with her; and behold the Lord Jesus came with His angels and, taking her soul, committed it to the care of Archangel Michael and withdrew. Early in the morning the Apostles raised her body on a litter, and placing it in the tomb, watched over it awaiting the coming of the Lord. And behold, the Lord was again present and He ordered the body to be taken up in a cloud into paradise, where now, reunited to the soul she enjoys eternal blessedness, rejoicing with His elect, for ever and ever" (cf. P.L. 71, 708).

The testimony of St. John Damascene (676-780) is familiar, because it occurs in the Breviary lessons for 18th August. It is the more significant because the saint was in a position to be acquainted with the traditions of the Levant at the time of the Arab invasions: as Stebbing says, "his work is a storehouse of the real traditions of the Catholic Church in the East". In his second sermon on the Dormition of the Mother of God, he says "We have received from ancient tradition that at the time of the glorious dormition of the blessed Virgin, all the Apostles who were travelling the whole world over for the salvation of souls were brought together at Jerusalem in a moment of time, having been caught up on high. And when they were there, there appeared to them a vision of angels and they heard the psalmody of the heavenly powers; and in this manner she surrendered her holy soul into the hand of God. Her body, however, which God accepted in an ineffable way being taken up accompanied by apostolic and angelic hymnody, was deposited in a grave at Gethsemani, in which place the Angels' song was heard for three whole days. But after three days, the angelic song

having ceased, the Apostles opened the tomb. For Thomas, who had been absent, had arrived on the third day and wished to pay his respects to that body which God had taken up, but they failed to find her sacred body anywhere in the place. Now when they found only those things with which she had been laid to rest and had been refreshed by a mysterious perfume, they closed to the tomb; astonished at the wonder of this mystery, they could only come to one conclusion: that as it had pleased God the Word and the Lord of Glory to take flesh and become Man and be born of the Virgin Mary, preserving intact her virginity after childbirth, so it had pleased Him also to preserve intact her immaculate body and to honour it before the common and universal resurrection, by translating it incorrupt after she had passed away. There were present besides the apostles, the most holy Timothy, first bishop of the Ephesians and Denis the Areopagite who bears witness in what he writes about the blessed Hierotheo, who was also present with the same Timothy." St. John then quotes a document which he evidently believed to be authentic and apostolical but which modern scholarship seems to have proved apocryphal—a matter to which we shall revert presently.

Throughout the Middle Ages there is no doubt at all that this truth was implicitly believed by all faithful Christians: SS. Peter Damian, Bernard, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, all Doctors of the Church; in the East, St. Nicephorus of Constantinople, St. Theodore Studite; in the West: Hugh of St. Victor, SS. Antonine, Bernardine of Siena, Thomas of Villanova, and among the uncanonized Melchior Canus, and Suarez—all either explicitly taught or defended at length or simply took for granted as indisputably part of the Catholic Faith, this glorious and beloved doctrine.

(d) The establishment of the doctrine had not however had an unchequered career; for although never was the *fact* of our Lady's corporal Assumption into heaven called seriously into doubt, the propensity for writers of the Dark Ages to decorate their most ancient traditions with an embroidery of apocryphal detail caused no little concern among the theologians and pastors of the day. We have seen St. John Damascene's reverence to the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius; other such accounts professing to give early testimony to detail which is now self-condemned by its blatant anachronisms, are referred to in the famous *Epistola ad Paulam et Eustochium*, by the pseudo-Jerome of the late eighth or early ninth century (cf. P.L. 30, 122).

Again in a sermon falsely attributed to St. Augustine, but more probably belonging to Ambrose Aupertius, O.S.B. (720-80) we read: "This therefore we say, brethren, that the Virgin Mary is said to have been assumed into heaven, as the Church of Christ has already accepted by traditional use; but in what manner she passed away to the heavenly kingdom, no Catholic history relates. The same Church of God is said not only to ignore these things but even to reject these fabulous stories." (*In fest. Ass. Sermo*, P.L. 39, 2129.)

Again among the pseudo-Augustinian works, we find a letter probably from the pen of Alcuin of York: "What therefore can we say of the death of Mary and her Assumption, since the Divine Scripture tells us nothing, save what is consonant with truth sought by reason? For mindful of the mortality of man, we do not hesitate to admit that she suffered according to the law of human destiny. . . . But shall we say she was held by the bonds of death and suffered common corruption: worms and dust? Shall this be the fitting fate for the chosen dwelling place of God? If he willed to preserve the integrity of His Mother's virginity, why shall He not keep Her intact from the corruption of the tomb? For the flesh of Jesus is the flesh of Mary. . . . He therefore ascended into heaven: He also translated the flesh which He took from His Mother above the stars." And the writer concludes thus: "Considering all these things, I must confess that Mary is in Christ and with Christ: in Christ, because it is in Him we live and move and have our being; with Christ, being gloriously assumed to heavenly joys, being received by the benignity of Christ more honourably than others as He has honoured her before others by grace; and she who mothered the Saviour of herself and the whole world was not subjected to the common fate after death of worms and dust and corruption" (P.L. 40, 1141 seq passim).

From these documents it will be seen that from time immemorial, the Church all the world over had just simply believed that our Lady was assumed body and soul into heaven shortly after her death; a simple faith, independent of the speculations of the theologians, independent in large measure of the spurious narratives in which it was early enshrined, and certainly independent of the legendary details, such as we have quoted at length from St. John Damascene. In fact, humanly speaking, these traditional "details" drawn largely from apocryphal narratives very nearly killed the

belief, and at one point we find a Roman Pontiff warning off the faithful in such strong terms that the most enlightened theologians would have scrapped the doctrine, had not the simple faith of the faithful continued placidly to hold on to its faith and to believe the essential fact of the Assumption—the victory of Faith over Theology!

“We do not deny,” writes Pope Gelasius (494) “that this favour has been granted to the Blessed Virgin Mary, because with God nothing is impossible, nevertheless to be cautious we should regard this rather as wishful thinking—*salva fide*—rather than hastily to define what is not known for certain.” In spite of this official cold douche, the hold of the mystery on the devotion of the Church intensified, as we have seen, in the establishment of the feast in various countries and the increasing solemnity with which it was celebrated in the centuries which followed. In 813 a synod at Mainz sanctioned the continued celebration of an ancient feast of the Assumption, but later in the same century we find the martyrologies of Ado and Usuardus entering the caveat: “Nevertheless our holy Mother the Church, which in its observances stands four-square to the exactest faith, keeps the memory and feast (of our Lady) venerable in such fashion that it doubts not that she passed on from this world in the flesh. But where, by divine counsel and goodwill, the Holy Spirit may have translated that temple, namely the flesh of the same most Blessed Virgin Mary, is a matter about which it is more pleasing to the sober piety of the Church to confess ignorance than to hold or teach frivolities and fables” (P.L. 123, 202). This passage had an interesting echo in Paris in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into which we cannot enter here.

These texts are most interesting as they show how the theologians and canonists tried to soft-pedal this doctrine, which the liturgy was nevertheless keeping before the people’s mind, presumably because they could find no “good,” that is written arguments for it. Nevertheless the living Faith of the Church world-wide, the ordinary day-to-day belief and teaching, divinely guided and quite irrepressible, has overcome the dubitations, not to say rationalism, of the “most approved authors.”

(e) There is a further argument for the Assumption of Our Lady which has taken on a new significance for the writer since his stay in the Middle East as a chaplain during the war; it is the absence of all relics, true or spurious, “*ex ossibus*”

of Our Blessed Lady. When one realizes the mercantile proclivities of the inhabitants of Palestine and the enormous price the faithful of the Middle Ages would have gladly given for such relics, when one sees with one's own eyes the astonishing instinct which seems to haunt the soldier serving overseas to collect "souvenirs," nothing can explain this amazing absence of trade where supply-and-demand runs so strongly, save a universal belief that there were no relics of the Virgin to be had; a belief not based on the material absence of relics in the land—for they could have been manufactured and "discovered" easily enough—but in some way deriving from absolutely certain tradition. No other hypothesis is really satisfactory.

II.

The writer then is of the opinion that the Assumption of Our Lady, body and soul into heaven is an article of divine and Catholic Faith, *ex magisterio ordinario*. This statement is likely to cause some astonishment, since it is common form in the theological manuals to characterize this doctrine as *proximum fidei*, i.e. as something which is so closely akin to some doctrine of the Faith that it cannot be denied without incurring the accusation of rashness. It would be well therefore to emphasize two points of general principle: first, that it is possible to recognize an indubitable article of divine Faith without it having been as yet defined as such; and secondly, that such divine doctrine *de fide* can be preserved and propagated by the ordinary magisterium of the Church. These two points agreed to, the writer invites his readers to agree with him that the Assumption of Our Lady is one of these doctrines; that it is of Faith, so that one who knowingly denies it is rejecting the teaching authority of the Catholic Church just as truly as one who denies—say, the Immaculate Conception.

(a) *A doctrine can be of divine Faith without it having been defined.* It should be clear that, since by defining an article of Faith the Council or Pope does not create a new Faith, the newly defined doctrine has been a matter of Faith before it was defined. Thus the Immaculate Conception was a matter of Faith, before it was defined, though perhaps not everyone recognized this at first.

If we consider the Faith through the eyes of the Fathers and early Doctors of the Church, we shall find that they regard the "deposit" as an organic whole: this is the "mysterion"

of Origen and Cyril, the true *gnosis* of Irenaeus, the *sacramentum* of Leo, the *evangelion* of the pseudo-Barnabas, the intellectual content of Augustine's City of God. It was believed to be entirely in the Scriptures, but not set out in little "quanta" each carefully labelled: "De Deo Trino, De Sacramentis, De Verbo Incarnato," etc., like a seminary theological course. The living Church preached, and preaching attested, this "mysterion"; and She alone knew what it contained. Not that the Church was always and actually contemplating in detail all the articles of the Faith; but as her pastors and theologians expounded now this now that aspect of the one all-embracing unity, She reacted from time to time to denounce errors or exaggerations which might creep into the expositions of the most learned or most devout of her preachers. Thus *homo-ousios* was defined at Nicaea and *theotokos* at Ephesus, but in either case the doctrine defined belonged already to the Faith; denial of it already was heresy as Athanasius and Cyril were already proclaiming. To borrow a metaphor from the magic lantern, the doctrine had always been on the slide; the Council did but bring the projection into focus on the screen, so that, being explicitly and in set terms defined, the true doctrine could be more easily and surely seen for what it was.

Probably had someone asked St. Justin in 150 A.D. whether according to the Christian Faith the Son of God was ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί, he would have replied: "Well, I haven't really thought about it in those terms yet; certainly I wouldn't say He isn't, and I think it would be very dangerous to the Christian Faith in the Saviour to deny it." In scholastic terms he would be saying: "Hoc est proximum fidei, et opinio contraria est temeraria." But less than two centuries later, Athanasius even before the Council of Nicaea is roundly proclaiming the Arians heretics for denying it; in other words, he regards it as *de fide*. What has happened is not that the Faith has grown—for if it was a part of the *mysterion* in Athanasius' day it was part of the *depositum* in Justin's—but that the faithful now see more clearly; Athanasius sees clearly what Justin apprehended only as in a glass, darkly.

Thus there is no reason why a doctrine which was regarded by trustworthy guides as *proxima fidei* in the fifth century should not be clearly seen as *de fide* in the tenth or twentieth. The test is: has the Church taught it and continued to teach it; believed it and continued to believe it? If there is serious doubt as to this, it is certainly wise to petition an official

declaration, to ask for a definition ; if not, any intelligent Catholic can say it is *de fide*.

(b) Our second fundamental principle is that *Divine Faith can be preserved and propagated by the ordinary magisterium of the Church*. The truth of this is evident from the nature of the teaching authority and the indefectible Faith of the Church. Our Lord did not restrict these qualities to the Supreme Pontiff or to the extraordinary gatherings of the world-wide Hierarchy which we call Œcumenical Councils ; and where He did not restrict, why should we ? Of recent years the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff has been so emphasized in the seminary courses that this principle—though contained in the treatises of all approved authors on the Church—has been overlooked and almost forgotten. But the principle stands.

Thus the Council of the Vatican says : “ All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic Faith which are contained in the Word of God, whether they be written or handed down by tradition, and which are proposed as divinely revealed to be believed by the Church whether by solemn judgment (i.e. definition, conciliar or papal) *or by the ordinary and universal teaching power of the Church* ” (Denz, 1792), “ And Pius IX was even clearer in a letter to the archbishop of Munich in 1863, later referred to and commended by the Council : “ That subjection which is obligatory by act of divine Faith is not to be limited to what has been explicitly defined by decrees of Œcumenical Councils, but also extends to what is traditionally taught as divinely revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world and retained by a world-wide and consistent consensus as belonging to the Faith ” (Denz, 1683/1536).

In the light of these texts the late (then Cardinal) Billot, S.J., whom no one in his senses would call a “ liberal,” baldly asserts : “ The regular proposition of articles of Faith on all occasions must *be prior to and independent of* (definition, or the solemn judgment of the magisterium ordinarium.) ” (Billot, *De Ecclesia*, p. 416).

The one and only certain test of whether a given doctrine is of the Faith, apart from definition, is whether it has been taught by the universal Church—quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus. And since the Church, the *Ecclesia discens* and *credens*, only believes what the *Ecclesia docens* teaches, we may say that what has been simply accepted and believed by the faithful ubique terrarum and in all ages, *that* must

necessarily be of the Faith. As we have said the ultimate test is : has the Church taught it and continued to teach it ; has the Church believed and continued to believe it ?

(c) The writer maintains that the doctrine of the Assumption stands up to this test and emerges with flying colours. For consider that this doctrine is imposed on the Church, the whole Church, devotionally, in the liturgy of 15th August, which is in all rites a feast day of obligation. It forms an integral part of the Rosary, a devotion recommended as a whole both by Pontifical legislation and the custom of centuries and the examples of hundreds of canonized saints. *Atqui lex orandi sequitur legem credendi ; ergo !*

Moreover, this doctrine is accepted without question as part of the Church's Faith by all the faithful whose mind has not been addled by excessive theologizing. A well-instructed Catholic laywoman remarked to the writer only a few days ago : " Before Father X— visited the parish to get us to sign a petition for the definition of the Assumption, I did not know that it was not a Catholic doctrine." Ask the next hundred Catholic you meet—yes, or the next hundred Orthodox, Armenian, Byzantine or Copt—if they believe that our Lady was assumed bodily into heaven after her death ; can you doubt what the answer will be ? And whence comes this conviction ? For it is not a necessary consequence of natural laws nor a historical certainty demonstrable by historical methods—how easy a critic could tear the " proofs " to shreds if they were to be judged on pure historical grounds ! Whence comes this conviction ?

Again ask your ordinary well-instructed Catholic *why* he believes in the Assumption. When he has recovered from the surprise of being asked such a question he will surely say : " because the Church teaches it." Undoubtedly the *Ecclesia discens* and *credens* believes in it—one is tempted to say, in spite of the theologians. Again, ask any Catholic theologian if you may hold that Mary was *not* assumed into heaven, and he will undoubtedly say : " Certainly not." Ask any priest if he would accept the submission and grant reconciliation to the Church of any convert who refused to accept this doctrine, and the reply will undoubtedly be a decided negative. Why ? Surely because, whatever the compilers of theological manuals may say, in fact, all recognize this doctrine as a matter of Faith, which all good Catholics accept on Faith, and which no one can deny who wishes to be recognized as a member of the Church.

Finally if the writer may appeal to his personal experience, he would remark that he learned the Faith from the lips of his mother and grandmother, who in turn had learnt the Faith in the bosom of their families and were both very deeply conscious of a family tradition going beyond the Reformation. In this instruction he does not recollect any great difference being made between the Assumption of Our Blessed Lady and—say—the Immaculate Conception. Both doctrines were simply presented to his infant mind as truths to be believed because they were matters taught by the Church ; on the other hand, it was made quite clear that other things he accepted uncritically as traditional were not matters of Faith (e.g. the crucifixion of St. Peter). Were they wrong ?

In fine, this doctrine first appears in writing about the end of the fifth century, already as an ancient traditional belief of the Church, independent of the apocrypha which professed to add corroborative detail to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative ; it is accepted by heretics and schismatics who separated from the unity of the Catholic Church before the end of the fifth century and who certainly would not have adopted a new-fangled Western invention after the Council of Ephesus. It is at this day accepted by all Catholics without a shadow of doubt, as any of us can verify at first hand.

Considering these things what conclusion can we come to save that the Assumption of Our Lady is a matter of divine and Catholic Faith ? In this opinion we are supported by the theologian Catharinus, and Dom Laurence Janssens, O.S.B., looks wistfully at that qualification before he capitulates to the fashion of the times, saying it is “at least” *proxima fidei*. “*Quae censura . . . sane hodie severior potiusquam mitior est ferenda*” *loc. cit.*, p. 961).

III.

What then are we to say about the proposal that this doctrine should be defined. It is common knowledge that there is at present a widespread and zealously urged campaign to persuade the faithful to petition the Holy See to define this doctrine. The writer is of the opinion that such a definition is unnecessary, for the very reasons put to the forefront of the campaign : namely that all Catholics of every rite firmly hold it to be true already. Never has he met a priest or heard of a bishop who denies the Assumption ; never has he hesitated about requiring assent to it from all his converts as an integral part of the Faith which they were professing their

desire to embrace ; and to be honest, he never had the slightest difficulty in securing assent from any who had once been instructed in the authority of the Teaching Church. Now unless the integrity of the Faith is in danger, there seems no necessity for a definition, which is essentially nothing more than a solemn judgment by the supreme authority as to what is or is not of the Catholic Faith.

By which it is not implied that all the doctrines of the Faith are defined or ought to be defined. The Church teaches, and her faithful children accept her teaching, through the magisterium ordinarium, which is always prior and independent of the extraordinary methods of conciliar or papal definitions. In fact, it seems to be agreed, even by the champions of a definition in this matter, that a definition is not necessary to preserve the integrity of the Faith. There is no doubt at all in the minds of any who accept the authority of the Church ; and for those who do not accept that authority, such a definition will be rather worse than useless. For no Protestant or Orthodox or Atheist who now disbelieves in the Assumption will begin to do so because a Church, whose authority he does not accept, solemnly assures him that it is so. He is quite likely to use that as another reason for continuing to refuse to accept the Church's authority.

But there are those who say that they favour a definition, not as a necessary evil, in order to safeguard the integrity of the Faith, but to increase devotion to our Lady under this mystery. Again, the writer cannot feel the force of this argument. If again he may appeal to his own experience as an ordinary member of the Church he would say "I am already fully convinced, from the ordinary teaching of the Church, that our Lady was assumed into heaven. No doubt on this matter adheres to my mind ; short of the Beatific Vision itself, nothing can make me *more* certain of our Lady's Assumption than I am already. All the devotion therefore that meditation on that mystery can produce is already actually or potentially mine, and an additional certification of its truth, from however distinguished a source, will not affect my soul one jot." A good boy who loves his mother has no need of a certificate from the Board of Social Survey (Ministry of Health) that she has the qualifications to make a good mother : she has, and he knows it ! Nor will he thank you for a considered appraisal of her personal beauty by the Royal Academy. In like manner the devotion of the pious Catholic towards our Holy Mother, Immaculate and Assumed,

owes little to theological definition, past or future. The pious Catholic has known better than the theologian in the past, and can dispense with his professional assistance in the future. If all Catholics are already convinced of the truth of this doctrine, how will the definition of it profit his devotion ?

On the other hand, there are some, we are informed (though the writer has never met them in real life) who assert that this truth is not definable if and because it is not explicitly contained in the Scriptures or it is not in the written traditions of the sub-apostolic age. This is nonsense. The Church has divine authority to define what her Faith is ; the Assumption of Our Lady is a truth of the Faith, as we have seen ; therefore the Church has divine authority to define the Assumption. The fact that it was contained in the primitive Faith of the apostolic age is proved by the fact that the Church believes it to this day. To demand more seems like insisting on a man bringing in person his birth-certificate to prove that he has been born !

Granted that the Assumption can be defined but that its definition is not necessary, what judgment are we to make of its expedience. Let us not pass over too lightly the twin dangers of repelling from their first approaches to the Faith the modern erudite Western agnostic on the one hand and on the other of giving the Orthodox dissidents of the Orient occasion for falling away from their present happy devotion to our Lady's Assumption. In the first place, many of our separated brethren in our own lands are being attracted to the Faith who are grievously hindered not only by ignorance of the doctrine of the Church, but also by ties of family and friendship, and by anticipation of moral conflict if they receive instruction and accept the Faith. Undoubtedly many such will be repelled—perhaps fatally repelled—in their first tentative steps towards the truth by a new and apparently totally unnecessary definition. To them it seems as though the "Roman Church" can go on inventing new dogmas indefinitely. To us Catholics this seems a childish objection, but it is a real difficulty for them. And they will probably meet this difficulty long before they have made the acquaintance of a friendly priest or a well-instructed, and sympathetic Catholic. Be it understood it is not a question of minimizing the Faith or suppressing this doctrine from the instructions we give to converts ; when the neophyte has got as far as convincing himself of the divine authority of the Church, he will accept this doctrine just as simply as we do. *Experto crede !*

Finally, I would appeal on behalf of our Lady for a little

more charitable understanding of our dissident brethren of the East. From time immemorial they have believed in the Assumption of Our Lady as a dogma of the world-wide, undivided, apostolic Church: as such their clergy preach it, as such their laity have had the deeper love for the Mother of God *in coelis assumpta*. Now if the "Romans" suddenly define this doctrine, there will not be wanting young theologians of the Orthodox communities who will be tempted to go out of their way to find in it another of the "errors of Rome." They will discover the undeniable fact that it would be very difficult to defend the Assumption on purely historical grounds and very easy to attack it. In making such attacks they would not be unsupported by the Protestant missionaries whose American generosity has made so deep an impression on the Near East in the last two generations. Of course the effect of such manœuvrings would not be obvious for some time, but there is no doubt a possibility that little by little the seminaries would be affected, and through them the parochial clergy and finally the laity would come to regard the Assumption of Our Lady as an ancient legend which "Rome" had wrongly erected into a dogma. And so millions of souls for whom Mary's Son died on the cross would come to love her less.

No! if a definition is not necessary, it is certainly not expedient.

DOM THOMAS RIGBY.

PRAYER TO JESUS OR THE ESSENCE OF ORTHODOX MONASTIC SPIRITUALITY¹

ONE of the most important kinds of monastic prayer in the Orthodox Church is the "prayer to Jesus" or "spiritual prayer." Its outward form—so to say its matter—is the repetition as frequently as possible of the name of Jesus joined to the prayer of the Publican "Lord Jesus, son of God have mercy on me a sinner." Its essence is to bring the intellect into the heart by simple thoughts about Jesus Christ, which enlightens the soul by grace and brings about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

¹ This is a translation of an article in *Dieu Vivant* 8. It is here published by the kind permission both of the author and the Editor to whom we are very grateful.—THE EDITOR.

The practice of this prayer is very old in the Eastern Church. It is a survival of a tradition which goes back to the Fathers of the Desert as found in the works of the great Christian thinkers of the third and fourth century.

Little known in the West this grand old tradition which is as it were the very soul of Eastern theology, has been revived by certain interesting researches¹ in recent years. But it is the work of Greek patristic scholars who are unaware of the modern form these traditions have taken in the Slavonic and modern Greek churches: without a knowledge of this tradition such texts remain often incomprehensible. As Fr. Hausherr has written: "The question of hesychasm is not only of historic interest—sufficient to deserve the attention of scholars working in this time of renewed studies in ascetic and mystical theology—but it is by no means dead in the Eastern Orthodox Church. There are those even who consider that of all the questions concerning the future of Greek and Slavonic religious life, this is one of the most important. Besides, hardly anything has yet been done: various quotations remain buried in manuscripts little known by scholars, or if a few have been published they are hardly more accessible than the manuscripts themselves, as for example φιλοχαλία τῶν αἰετῶν νηπτικῶν." We may add that hardly any Russian ascetic literature which could supply enlightenment on the traditional or restored practice of spiritual prayer, is known at all in the West.

"Remember that the practice of interior spiritual prayer was the chief preoccupation of the "God-bearing" (θεοφόροι) Fathers of old and was taken up by the monks, both hermits and those living in community, such as Mount Sinai, the hermits of Egypt and Nitria, in Jerusalem and its neighbouring monasteries in fact throughout the East, from Constantinople to Mount Athos and the Archipelago and even now, by God's grace, in Russia." These are the opening words of the first chapter on spiritual prayer by the great Russian starets of the seventeenth century, Paisi Velitchkovski.²

So, according to one of the keenest promoters of spiritual prayer in Russian monasticism, its practice goes back to the earliest Christian times and is part of the inheritance of the Orthodox Church. In their writings P. Velitchkovski and

¹ Cf. J. Hausherr: *La méthode d'oraison hésychaste*. M. Viller: *La Spiritualité des premiers siècles Chrétiens*, Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1930.

² From *Entretiens sur la prière de Jesus*. Translated from the Russian and published at Valaam, 1938.

his followers want to make patristic works on the prayer to Jesus known among Slavonic monks and thereby to show that they are not innovators but restorers rather of an old and venerable tradition of the Church. Such was the purpose, for example, in translating the well-known *Philokalia*, which together with the Bible and the menology of Dimitri of Rostov was during the first half of the nineteenth century the favourite spiritual treatise among Russian monks. Paisi's school is only continuing the tentative work in the sixteenth century of S. Nil Sorski, the first Russian writer to attempt to treat of the spiritual life.

Although none of the works of Sorski, Velitchkovski or their followers are really scholarly, the researches of modern historians have confirmed the correctness of their surmises. Thus the works of J. Hausherr and M. Viller seem to show that the hesychasm of Mount Athos in the fourteenth century has its origins in the greatest antiquity. According to Hausherr,¹ it was Evagrius of Pontus (399) a disciple of both Macarius the great, founder of the settlement in the desert of Skete and of the great doctors Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, who first mentions the idea of "pure prayer" which we find later in the teachers of the prayer of Jesus. But Evagrius' teaching in his *De Oratione* is only a synthesis of the ancient wisdom of the Fathers of the Desert and of the mysticism of Origen and the school of Alexandria. When about the eighth century a purely ascetic as distinct from a mystic conception of prayer seemed under Theodore the Studite to dominate Byzantine monasticism the tradition of Evagrius was upheld by the monks of Sinai. Not only did they identify pure prayer with the one word prayer which consisted of the bare repetition of the name of Jesus,² but they went far to spread in the monastic world a spirituality centred about the person of Christ and maintaining with him a love and intimacy quite unusual in Byzantine religious life. "Let the memory of Jesus be your very breath," said St. John Climacus, the great monastic teacher of Sinai and such words are the dominant theme of hesychast teaching on spiritual prayer. If St. Gregory of Sinai, the fourteenth century protagonist of the hesychast movement in the monasteries of Mount Athos, recommends the writings of St. John Climacus, Philotheus of Sinai and the *Centuries* of Hesychius, more than any others it is only because he recognized that they taught sound spirituality.

¹ Cf. *Rev. d'ascétique et de mystique*, No. 15, 1934.

² Cf. Viller-Rahner, *Ascese u Mystik*, p. 226.

A full examination of this would take us beyond the limits of this article. It is enough to say that Gregory relies on them when he makes prayer the centre of spiritual life. "To remain in intimacy with God is for him the aim of all intellectual and moral effort," being "the source of all virtues, food of the soul, mother of tears and light to the mind."

Likewise, the distinctions he makes between the various degrees of prayer, notably by ruling out more or less wholly all sense images, are undoubtedly drawn from St. Climacus' *Spiritual Ladder*.

It is clear, therefore, that Gregory did not introduce in the fourteenth century at Mount Athos any new teaching, but was simply handing down through the monks to the Greek and Slav Christians of today the ascetic and mystic traditions of the East.

Allusion has been made to the works of two Russian monks, Nil Sorski and Paisi Velitchkovski who went on pilgrimage to Sinai and carried back with them besides a deep knowledge of patristic literature the practice of the prayer of Jesus. Thus sown in Russian soil, the seed of an old tree developed a fresh and vigorous life. Among those who took up the inheritance of Greek hesychasm should be mentioned St. Seraphim of Sarov (1769-1833) the great starets Pustin, Leo (1769-1841), Macarius (d. 1860), Ambrose (1812-91), Bishops Ignatius Brianchaninov (1807-67) and Theophanes Govorov called the hermit (1815-94). Nearer our own time Fr. John of Kronstadt (d. 1908). But steeped in the same ideal, flows the vast stream of known and unknown people, monks, nuns, priests, pilgrims and "innocents" going from shrine to shrine on the high roads of Russia and finally simple layfolk who hid a life of prayer beneath an apparently ordinary life.

One of the strangest instances of the spread of the prayer of Jesus among Russians is a *Pilgrim's Story to his Spiritual Father*,¹ an anonymous and popular work of the late nineteenth century. It describes the spiritual experience of one of these unknown pilgrims who were wandering through the forests and steppes of Siberia carrying as his only possession a bible and a copy of *Philokalia*. Looking for nothing but solitude, he chanced to encounter in peasant, employee or smallholder brothers who shared with him the one longing to be totally absorbed in prayer.

English trans. from Russian by R. M. French. S.P.C.K., London, 1930 and 1941.

Other Russian writings on spiritual prayer describe miscellaneous experiences some of which show much intellectual culture. For example, "Chapters on spiritual prayer" by the starets P. Velitchkovski, some prefaces to patristic writings of his friend starets Basil,¹ the *Instructions*² of Seraphim of Sarov, some *Letters on Faith and Life* by Bishop Theophanes Govorov. All these are most valuable for understanding spiritual prayer, though it must be remembered that the tradition is passed on chiefly by word of mouth. Near the chief Russian monasteries and in close touch with them there was a *poustinia*, a kind of hermitage or skete as it is called, consisting of a few hermitages where a group of monks lived under an elder. There, at some distance from the noise of travellers and the activity of the monastery one or two hermits would give themselves up specially to mental prayer. Only very privileged laymen or some young monks who felt called to a life of solitude were ever allowed to go there. There they were given the old-time instruction in spiritual prayer by personal contact and specially suited to the character and experience of each. All the Russian startsi from P. Velitchkovski to Theophanes the hermit, insist that anyone who wants to follow the way of contemplative prayer must go to a master with experience and do exactly as he says in all obedience. "The Holy Fathers," says Paisi, "call this prayer an art." The reason is, so it seems, that since no one can learn an art without being taught, so it is impossible to devote oneself to spiritual prayer without an experienced guide.³ Hence it follows that any mere theoretical knowledge of spiritual prayer unaccompanied by experience interpreted by a spiritual director, must remain sketchy and inadequate.

We have shortly described this spiritual prayer as consisting of the repetition of the name of Jesus accomplished by intelligence in the heart. We must now explain it more in detail.

In the first place the essential element in this prayer is the name of Jesus. The starets Paisi describes it as "bringing our most sweet Jesus repeatedly into the heart, and being moved by a loving affection for him by the constant repetition of his name."⁴ The connexion so made between the name

¹ Cf. *Entret.* *ibid.*, p. 216.

² Cf. Prepodobnij Seraphim Sarowskij, pp. 153-180, Paris, 1930. Also *St. Seraphim of Sarov*. A. F. Dobbie-Bateman. S.P.C.K., 1936.

³ Cf. *Entret.* *ibid.*, p. 294.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 299.

and the person of Jesus Christ is striking. To invoke Jesus by name is only to bring him into our very being. The power invested in the name is that of Christ himself. The warmth of his grace as found in the use of his name, which excites the heart with a pure and holy love. It would be wrong to regard this as psychic or nominalist. The prayer to Jesus is not a mere exercise intended to create by mechanical repetition a psychological monoideism. It is not so much a matter of starting a psychic mechanism as of freeing one's spiritual spontaneity, a shout of the heart which by saying the holy name brings Christ into our presence like water gushing out. The name of Christ is clearly something more than a mere symbol, or rather it is only so if there is a real relation between the instrument and the thing itself. It both shows and represents, just as the eikon in the Orthodox Church both represents and is for the believer the power of Christ and his saints.

This explains why for the supporters of the prayer of Jesus, the pronunciation of the holy name is both a means and an end. It is a means since the use of a word is a help to human weakness which is ill able to remain fixed in one place and concentrate on one thing. The great defect in fallen nature is an interior disorder, a scattering of thoughts and feelings which makes it so difficult for man to fix his attention on God. Prayer and the prayer to Jesus in particular tends to re-establish order not by summing up in a few words the essence of our Faith, but through the name of Jesus grace is imparted to man so that he can drive away diabolic influence which has established this disorder and falsehood. By calling on our Lord's help against the devil and our passions by prayer we can witness their defeat at the sound of that name and see in it Almighty God's power.¹

But if prayer to Jesus is one of the best instruments in the contest with the forces of evil whose chief work is to destroy every spiritual work of man, it is also an end in itself. The idea is so to let oneself be absorbed by saying the holy name, that is by the very person of Christ that the transcendental reality of God becomes known and transmitted through that name and dominates one's whole being until the very heartbeat becomes prayer and glorifies our Lord. So long as this prayer remains mechanical and mental its full purpose has not been reached. The soul must immerse itself in prayer, which must

¹ Starets Rasik cited by C. Cetwerikow in life of *Paisi Welitchkowski*, p. 90.

absorb it until the light of the holy name can reach the very depth of our being and light it up. This is what the startsi mean when they tell their pupils to go down from the mind into the heart. It is not just a matter of a mere intellectual grasp of the meaning of the words accompanied by a certain amount of emotional warmth. The name of Jesus actually brings the presence of God with it. The part of the soul is to let itself expand to this real presence until its innermost being is permeated and enlightened.

From the individual's point of view, that is, so far as lifting him up, the startsi usually talk of two stages in the spiritual life. (There are probably thousands of different degrees, but this first classification is useful.) Thus, the old idea was that in the first stage one is conscious of personal and laborious effort—that is, active or laborious prayer.

Laborious (Active) Prayer. If we say that in the first stage acts of the will dominate, at least apparently, it does not mean that all grace is lacking ; but often it operates unknown to the subject. It works away hard and produces no results. Undoubtedly it is only by grace that man decides to dedicate himself to God and longs for the gift of prayer. But what he encounters at the beginning is irksome work, a losing battle with the passions, bad thoughts, depression, sadness and struggles in which he is often beaten or anyhow weakened and discouraged by his sins and inability to improve. Is all this a sign of the withdrawal of God's grace? No, for it is precisely towards this state of things that God wants to lead him. "The way to perfection is the way that leads to a realization of one's blindness, wretchedness and bareness and so to the inevitable concomitant of these—to repentance and a feeling of utter worthlessness, in fact to perfect contrition."¹ So, on the very threshold of the path that should bring us to the highest states of prayer we encounter, according to these Russian startsi, the discovery of our own sinfulness and contrition. Does this mean that for the teacher of spiritual prayer, the struggle with evil and other ascetic practices are of no value? By no means. The fight with our passions, vain or bad thoughts are just typical of the first stage in the spiritual life, what is called laborious prayer. Again, has asceticism as such any rightful place? Undoubtedly it is better according to the Fathers to fall and get up than never to fall and not have to repent. Yet on the other hand it

¹ *Entret.* *ibid.*, p. 395.

would be risky to give oneself to prayer, in a state of sin. Let them beware who content themselves with a false tranquillity, by convincing themselves that no one can avoid all sin, wilful or involuntary. It is right that man should struggle against sin to the limit of his strength. After a fall we get up humbly begging God's mercy. By suffering and struggling he will be really alive and thereby lay the foundation of a new life. *No, no peace, no easy time, very little confidence in self or anything one does.* Theophanes the hermit has very well put this twofold requirement of the spiritual life "Suffer to the limit. Give all your strength to the utmost, but your salvation depends on God. Our Lord only wants what is good for us and is only too ready to let us have it. But he is waiting till we are ready and fit to receive his gifts." This is why the problem of how to control myself changes into "how to be ready to accept strength which God is waiting to bestow on us." And the answer is "to be ready for grace means to be fully aware of our own nothingness and lack of strength. It is to realize that our Lord can and will supply."¹ So every spiritual and moral effort, all acts of asceticism are only of any worth if they help towards an humility which without ever complaining in face of man's wretchedness, yet brings him back to admitting his own helplessness and to that fundamental prayer "Lord Jesus Christ be merciful to me a sinner." For one who is aware of his own wretchedness it is no longer merely a meritorious act but a cry of the heart at once of despair and hope, an irresistible and constant need of calling in Christ's help in the struggle with the devil and the evil propensities of our nature which he uses.

Before expressly dealing with the prayer itself, we must mention one other condition necessary, for anyone aspiring to spiritual prayer according to the teaching of the ancients. This is the matter of obedience. But not obedience to ecclesiastical authority so much as submission to one's spiritual director, freely chosen of course but when once chosen the novice binds himself to him body and soul. "Whoever wants to learn the ways of the spiritual life, according to Scripture must submit to obedience of body and soul, which means handing oneself over entirely to a God-fearing man who keeps the commandments scrupulously and is experienced in the spiritual life, and surrender oneself wholly to his will and judgment."² The teaching of Russian startsi agrees

¹ Ibid., p. 383.

² *Entret.*, p. 295.

absolutely with that of the Greek hesychasts,¹ though emphasizing a little more than they the freedom of the mutual choice involved in spiritual fatherhood.

What is the real purpose of this ascetic obedience? First of all it sets the novice free from all anxiety as to his soul and body and from any attachment to things; thereby bringing him to that serenity and spiritual calm which is a condition of real liberty; only he who has renounced all self-will, that is, his own superficial personality, the slave of this world, is capable of devoting himself to a life of prayer. The other advantage of obedience is to save us from too great haste in trying to reach high states of prayer all at once, and as a sure reaction falling a victim to the snares of the devil. One of the commonest impediments in a life of prayer is "a diabolical pride which wants to fathom the mysteries of divine grace before being called by God." The only proper remedy to such disastrous impatience is to submit to the wise counsel of a director capable of telling the point reached by the soul and helping it on step by step to contemplative prayer.

So far we have only spoken of the atmosphere in which to undertake a life of prayer. The prayer itself apparently seems to offer little difficulty. It is simply a matter of repeating hundreds and thousands of times "Lord Jesus son of God be merciful to me a sinner." It is the very simplicity of it which gives rise to many temptations. Upright and experienced souls like the pilgrim in the *Story* are well able to carry this out and so make great progress. But most people find in it monotony and discouragement, and it only seems to them an irksome and wasteful task which the mind is always trying to avoid.

However, as we said before, it is by no means simply a question of forming a habit by mechanical repetition. In fact the advocates of prayer to Jesus are very much against anything formal or mechanical; the two principal dangers in monastic prayer. Just as too great attention to externals either in asceticism or mortification, so a too great concern with quantity in the prayer of Jesus can become pharisaic and a self-glorification. For those who try to be satisfied with getting through a more or less long quota of prayers, or by singing a lot of psalms or tropes, who make their spiritual life depend too much on the number of prayers said, it is taught that what matters is quality rather than quantity.² "Do not

¹ J. Hausherr, *La Méthode*, etc., p. 157.

² C. Cetwerikow, *P. Velitchkovski*, T. II, p. 89-90.

bother about how many prayers you say," wrote Theophanes the hermit, "but make your prayer burst from your heart full of life as from a fountain. Get rid altogether of the idea of quantity."¹ This advice may seem a bit paradoxical when continuous repetition seems to be of the very essence of the prayer of Jesus. In actual fact, it only serves to create a purely psychological and superficial effect. Prayer would be nothing more than a flow of empty words if it were not accompanied by what in ascetic language is called attention, the *προσοχή* of the Greek hesychasts.

In what does this attention consist? At prayer the intellect must go down to the heart and stay in the heart. Western commentators have often given a restricted and shallow meaning to this. By describing certain psycho-physiological phenomena as found in some of the writings of hesychasts and particularly in the well-known *Μέθοδος τῆς ἱερᾶς προσευχῆς*² which recommends thinking of the anatomical position of the heart, and restricting breathing to keep time with the repetition of prayers, even serious writers have referred to this staying in the heart or *omphaloscopy* and have tried to find in it one of the characteristics of hesychast prayer. They have confused a certain external technique which has been criticized even in circles favourable to the prayer of Jesus, with the spiritual effort which it is intended to sustain. The real object is to lead the soul to feel somehow physically (auto-perception which we have of ourselves as physical beings differs as one fixes one's attention on the various parts of the body)³ that the centre of one's personality is not in the mind—the point of contact between the spiritual powers of the soul and the outside world—but in the heart or rather those mysterious depths of our being of which it is the symbol.⁴ The purpose of the technique is only as an instrument. It is a formidable tool which a beginner must learn to master by placing himself in the hands of an experienced master. His position should neither be exaggerated nor explained away by some pseudo-spiritual rationalism which is quite unchristian. Attention at prayer which is a first condition for the intellect going to the heart, is really a concentration of all one's efforts on the prayer pushing aside anything that may distract one; a pre-occupation of soul and body with the living God. It must be a sustained conscious effort of the will dragging with it, by

¹ *Entret.*, p. 359.

² J. Hausherr, *ibid.*, p. 102.

³ *Entret.*, p. 79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

whatever means, the dead weight of our rebellious body. It consists of a double action; first of reluctance and then of acceptance: reluctance of nature (meaning here not physical nature but a preoccupation of the soul with external things) stimulated by the powers of evil: and acceptance of God's will and giving oneself up to him. A conscientious disciplined soul which cuts off all external affairs, is carried on to interior heights where alone by the light of the Holy Spirit our human personality can contact God, "the Lord is looking for souls full of love for God and its neighbour. It is on such a throne that he longs to be seated and on which he appears in the fullness of his Glory."²

In order to understand better what is meant by attention we ought to define what is meant by heart and mind (intellect) in Eastern spiritual language. The Russian word "um" which we render mind or intellect corresponds to *νοῦς* in Greek. This represents not just intellect in the rationalist sense but all the cognitive and contemplative faculties, reason and conscience which make a man a free individual.³ The Greek Fathers and with them the Russian *startsi* take the mind to be the likeness of God in man. To use more up-to-date language we may call it personal consciousness which inspires all human life which itself is rather like a tangled skein in touch with diverse realities. Heart in the traditional sense means the centre of one's being, "the source of activity of both intellect and will, the starting point and terminus of the whole spiritual life."¹ From it starts the whole psychological and spiritual life of man and through it he approaches and communicates with the Source of Life. The result is that no spiritual life which does not come from the heart can be anything but delusion and deceptive because it is not real, and does not come from the depth of one's being; so all conversion of life must come from the heart. Indeed, it is at the fountain head that man is led astray by letting the clear water be contaminated by the mud of original sin. "But when grace takes possession of the heart it dominates one's whole being and all one's thoughts. For mind and thoughts meet in the heart."⁴

¹ Cf. V. Lossky, *La Théologie Mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient*, p. 197 (Paris, 1944).

² S. Seraphim, *Entret. sur la Doctrine du Saint-Esprit*, Semeur 1928, p. 282.

³ Lossky, *ibid.*, pp. 196 and 197.

⁴ S. Macarius, *Hom. Spirit.*, xv 32, P.G. t. 34, col. 597B.

According to Bishop Ignatius Briantchaninov "the spiritual life of man is twofold. On one side there is the heart where arise feelings and intuitions by which man can know God unaided by reason: on the other the head or brain which is the seat of the intellect."¹ Man's fullest development is obtained by a proper balance of these two. Without the intellect, movements of the heart remain but blind impulses. Also, without the heart which is the source of action and of life, mere intellect is ineffective.

Ontologically, the principal effect of the Fall is this spiritual disruption by which man loses his centre of gravity and dissipates himself in the world about him. "This world is his brain where his thoughts jostle about like falling snowflakes or swarms of gnats."² Through the brain the mind knows the world outside itself and at the same time loses touch with spiritual things which the heart continues to cling to impotently and blindly. To rebuild the life of grace, a proper harmony between intellect and heart must be re-established.

For a deliberate return of the intellect to the interior life there must be a complete break with the outside world. He who intends living a spiritual life must give up seeing the world and "turn his back on pleasant sights and as it were keep his eyes shut."³ When blind to the outer world, he must then become deaf and dumb to it too,⁴ by giving up all social intercourse; though outward silence is only a preparation for the much deeper silence of soul. For not only must sense perceptions and spoken words be got rid of, but every desire, thought and image no matter how holy, in fact, any idea that will take the soul outside, away from its own heart where there is nothing but suffering and its saving Name. Of this interior silence, St. Seraphim says "it is the cross on which man must immolate himself with all his passions and lusts,"⁵ it is "the passion suffered with Christ"⁶ and also "the sacrament of the world to come."⁷ In fact, it is only by suffering that the soul can reach the mystic sanctuary of the heart where it will find God.

This is the narrow way of laborious prayer. It is a rough and bare desert where a traveller must deliberately shut his

¹ *Entret.*, p. 59.

² *Év. Théoph.*, *Entret.*, p. 58.

³ S. Seraphim, *Instructions*, 28.

⁴ *Entret.*, p. 421.

⁵ S. Seraphim, *Instructions*, 38.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 94.

eyes to any mirage of consolation. For he must not only get rid of all earthly images, but even those of apparently supernatural origin, visions, voices, sensible devotion which are often only our mental balance disturbed by lust, exaggerated mortification or an impatient attempt to anticipate the moment of grace by self-gratification in visions or day-dreams. Also particularly at the beginning of the spiritual life, it is wise to picture to oneself absolutely nothing (even representations of God described in Scripture which may be employed at other times, should certainly not be at prayer time). This is proper self-abnegation, holy moderation in those who live only by faith and prayer. Prayer is in fact an operation not of the *imagination* but of *faith*.

"The rule for prayer is to picture nothing, and after concentrating the mind on the heart to remain convinced that God is there who both sees and is listening, to bow down before him who is terrifying in his majesty and close to us in intimacy. We must force ourselves to a prayer without images. Realize by faith that God *is near*, and do not trouble about *how*." (Bp. Theophanes the hermit).¹

If this spiritual way leads into the desert, it will not be in complete darkness. Faith will light up the only image that can give support, namely the holy name of Jesus. Prayer is in fact just waiting in an attitude of faith.

Even when a high degree of mastery over psychical and spiritual forces has been obtained, man is not capable of restoring his lost harmony of mind and heart. All he can do is to achieve that silence and emptiness of soul which indicates extreme tension and complete self-abandonment in faith and hope to the gift of the Holy Spirit. "Longing and contrition are as it were the floor of the sanctuary"² wrote Bp. Ignatius Briantchaninov, or again it is like the arcade of the pool of Bethsaida where the various infirm persons are waiting for the angel to move the water and cure them.³ But only our Lord can give that healing and entrance to the sanctuary and at that hour which he alone knows in his ineffable and loving care. We are now a little beyond laborious prayer and on the border of charismatic prayer.

The Russian startsi are very reserved in all the higher stages of the spiritual life; for, we are really then concerned with things for which human language is not adequate. Is it

¹ Év. Théoph., *Entret.*, p. 70.

² *Entret.*, p. 419.

³ St. John v, 2-4.

not a waste, dangerous even, to speak of these spiritual realities to those who are still steeped in material concepts? It is useless to open your heart till it is necessary wrote St. Seraphim of Sarov. "You will probably only find one in a thousand capable of keeping your secret." It is not from them so much as from friends who had been in touch with divine things that we catch a glimpse of the graces that enlightened St. Seraphim or the startsi of Optino. Although more intellectual and conversant with Western ideas Bp. Ignatius Briantchaninov and Bp. Theophanes Govorov are not much more explicit.

The first sign of the grace which heralds a change of prayer is according to every master of the spiritual life a flood of tears of repentance. The early attempts at prayer in which the soul proclaims its faith and its own wretchedness are like the work of a well-borer. It works down through layer upon layer of solid psychological rock for the spring of heart-felt repentance; this is a clear sign of God's grace. Genuine tears, not those stimulated by despair or injured pride, show that the foundation of one's being which is encased in a thick layer of pride and self-confidence has been shaken. There is to be found that tenderness of feeling which melts at the first touch of grace "The sun of justice, Christ our Lord, shines forth from the heart which sheds tears."¹

The Holy Spirit fulfils his mission in a soul prepared for him by laborious prayer, by the intellect going to the heart where it meets evidence of its supernatural origin and of its failings, that have been purified by tears.

"First, grace confronts man with his sin and keeps it before him until he is compelled to form his own opinion of himself. It brings home the meaning of the Fall, in which the human race has partaken of the sin of Adam. Then, bit by bit, at prayer time there comes that deep longing and tenderness of heart. The instrument being ready, all of a sudden, unexpectedly supernaturally, grace touches the various parts which then combine. 'Who touched me?' It is difficult to express. I saw nothing, heard nothing, but I found I was different. I just found myself like this by some great power. The Creator has acted in this personal restoration just as he did at the creation. When touched by him, intellect, will, body all combined to become one. They are then merged into God and maintained so, as long as his hand will keep them there."²

So the essential first grace (a free gift of which sincere

¹ S. Seraphim, *Instruct.*, II.

² Theoph: in *Entret.*, p. 97.

repentance is as it were the negative aspect) is the re-establishment of man's nature in the state of original justice. The intellect and will as the two pivots of our interior life reunite so as to blend harmoniously with conflicting tendencies and build up by grace a well-ordered person. It should be noticed that we are not describing any praeternatural condition or ecstasy or anyhow not a state that is essentially so. Undoubtedly no soul can remain steeped in God unless supported by him and it seems that our human nature can hardly bear this for more than a few moments. Yet after ecstasy, the supernatural effects of grace remain. A profound ontological change has taken place, a new man has come into being with new faculties, powers and visions. Where there used to be confusion, now there is order under the influence of God's presence which asserts itself somewhat as a mathematical axiom would, but in a vastly superior way.

The most striking effect of this combination of intellect and will is a complete change of prayer. If it had been hitherto laborious or perhaps irksome, now it bursts out spontaneously, effortless, warming the heart and filling it with light, peace and joy. Although ecstasy is an exceptional gift only given to a few, this change of prayer is quite normal and a reliable sign that grace is working in the soul. This is how the pilgrim describes the change in the *Story*, "one fine morning I was taken unawares at my prayer and found I could not enunciate my usual morning prayers but my one desire was to recite the prayer of Jesus. The moment I started I was full of joy and greatly relieved. My mouth uttered the words of itself without my help, and I was in a state of utter joy all day, I seemed cut off from all around and lived as in another world. . . . All that summer I spent in uninterrupted vocal prayer to Jesus, feeling absolute peace of soul. I imagined I would give myself up entirely to prayer. All those I met on my way became to me as dear as my closest relations though I did not have much to do with them. All sense-impressions had stopped, I had no other thought but for my prayer which my mind began to hear. Since then I am always on the roam and am always saying my prayer of Jesus which is to me the loveliest and dearest thing on earth. Sometimes I do sixty miles a day and hardly feel I have done anything, I only feel I have prayed. If it is very cold I only have to repeat my prayer with rather more earnestness to find myself warmed. If I am hungry I repeat the name of Jesus a little more often and I forget I ever wanted food. When I am ill or my back,

legs or arms ache, I listen to the words of my prayer and I no longer feel any pain. If I am insulted I only have to reflect how lovely is the prayer of Jesus for the harm and any resentment it may have given to be forgotten. I have almost become insensitive, I have no interests or wants, nothing attracts me any more. I only want to pray and pray continuously and then I am overjoyed.”¹ This confession of the anonymous pilgrim is in perfect agreement with all the masters of the spiritual life.

Perhaps, St. Seraphim of Sarov has most concisely and clearly epitomized the state. “When our Lord warms up your heart with his grace and connects up the faculties of your soul, then an uninterrupted prayer develops within you. It will never leave you, you will delight in it and it will feed you.”²

The effects of this uninterrupted prayer are spiritual warmth, calm, and detachment from worldly things and especially a love of God. The starets Paisi wrote “Those who want close intimacy with Jesus by charity, are indifferent to the beautiful things of earth, its delights and even of bodily rest and want nothing but the heavenly flights of the soul in uninterrupted prayer.”³ Prayer to Jesus because it lifts the heart towards God seems to be an effect of charity in the soul stirring it to new life. “The warmth of the heart is supernatural charity; it lights up when God touches the heart, for it is Love itself and just a touch from him will stir up love of him.”

In this new phase of life, the possibility of temptation and even of sin is not altogether eliminated. But such clear spiritual perception is given with this prayer that triumph over interior enemies is not difficult. Up to now the soul has been in the dark and when attacked has only been able to hit out blindly at unseen opponents. But God’s presence is now like a lantern placed constantly in the soul lighting up every corner.

This state of prayer is, then, not so much one of inaction and rest as of an effective purifying with great joy even though faithfulness to grace may still, according to Bp. Theophanes, require painful sacrifices.

A special characteristic of the Russian startsi shows itself more in practice than in their teaching. This uninterrupted prayer far from isolating one from one’s fellow men, has rather the opposite effect. If in the early stages almost complete

¹ *The Way of the Pilgrim, supra.* pp. 26-30; but above translation is from the French of the article.

² *Entret.*, p. 421.

³ *ibid.*, p. 299.

silence and isolation seem an essential condition for progress, a point comes when the habit of prayer is well rooted and a fuller contact with one's fellow men seems to amount almost to a divine command. St. Seraphim of Sarov and the startsi of Optino received thousands of pilgrims, and got innumerable letters which they answered. If for Nil Sorski in the sixteenth century this sort of apostolate seemed a kind of sacrifice of himself in all charity for his brothers, for the startsi of the nineteenth century it is only the full realization of their vocation. Mystic prayer can still ring in their heart in tune with its very beats and constitute the backbone of their interior life without in the least preventing them taking part in the life of their fellow men.

This leads us to consider how spiritual prayer can suit the ordinary Christian. P. Velitchkovsky has already admitted that the prayer to Jesus is quite suitable for the laity. However, among the Moldavian startsi, it is essentially the basis of monastic prayer. For Paisi and his followers it is intimately connected with monastic revival in Slav countries. Their writings and admonitions are particularly addressed to monks who alone really can hope to reach the higher states of prayer. But this was not quite the attitude of nineteenth century startsi. Certainly even for them monastic life was still regarded as the most favourable way to intimacy with God. But experience had shown them that any prayer kindled by charity is not harmed by work for others. This gave them a fresh outlook on the spiritual life and showed that even in the higher states it is not incompatible with life in the world and a good deal of refinement. St. Seraphim has drawn up a rule of prayer for layfolk. By allowing a certain layman Motovilov see into one of his most extraordinary illuminations he suggests that all may receive the gift of prayer. Theophanes the hermit gave the same view and says prayer is only incompatible with a bad and useless life. It is quite wrong to suppose that to pray one has to be sitting quietly alone somewhere. To pray there is no need to hide yourself except in your heart and to see our Lord sitting there with you as David did.¹

Undoubtedly the interior life does involve recollection and, too, a certain amount of solitude. But if absolute solitude cannot be had, surely everybody can snatch periods for the prayer of Jesus by which to strengthen and enliven his soul, to such an extent that by taking root there it will remain intact even amid a disturbing life in the world. So, according to

¹ *Entret.*, p. 349.

modern masters of Orthodox mystical theology, uninterrupted prayer to Jesus can and should be the normal spiritual life of every Christian. Yet this does not mean that they belittle or underrate the higher states of mystic prayer.

We have alluded to the reserve of certain Orthodox mystics and to their reluctance to discuss the graces they have received. Let us have the very detailed account given by St. Seraphim. He says "when intellect and will combine in prayer and the soul is recollected, the heart is warmed and the brightness of Christ shines about spreading peace and joy interiorly."¹ This brightness of Christ is neither wholly in the senses nor in the intellect but in the depth of the soul. Yet, as we shall see it can sometimes be actually seen with the eyes of those who receive that grace. This light is discernible by those only who live by it and in it. It is the experience of something childlike and yet ineffable. But as children do not speak much and the gift of the Spirit is only, as it were, the birth of a new spiritual life, this gift is only the delight of the human soul in the glory of Almighty God.

Prayer here is beyond description. If as St. Seraphim says, "by prayer we become able to talk with God," yet it must stop as soon as the grace of God enters our heart. When God comes to us we must stop prayer, for how can we be asking him to come into our soul and purify it and dwell there when he whom we trust and whose name we are invoking is already within us.

We will end this study by some words of John Tikhonoff who was present at one of St. Seraphim's transports of prayer. If the example is not exactly one of the prayer of Jesus, yet several details show it to have been a mystic experience closely allied to spiritual prayer.

"This is what I can say of poor old Seraphim. One day as he read in St. John's gospel there are many mansions in my Father's house, I was seized with a violent desire to see them. I spent five days and five nights in prayer asking for that grace. And our Lord in his great kindness allowed me this consolation and showed them to me and there I saw in a wonderful moment (whether in the body I know not) the beauty of heaven, Father . . . and Seraphim stopped, leaned forward and lowering his head and shutting his eyes, put his hand over his heart. His face lit up bit by bit and shone with a brightness which became such that I could not bear to look at it. His face all the time was so full of joy that it

¹ *Instructions*, 10, op. cit., p. 159, etc.

could have been an angel. All the time he seemed intent on something he saw and could hear. Then after a long pause he gave a deep sigh full of joy and said : ' If only you knew what joy and happiness awaits the just in heaven, you would be ready to bear cheerfully all the trials, suffering and persecution of this life. Even if we were to be gnawed by worms throughout life we ought to accept it gladly, so as not to miss the wonderful joy God has prepared for those who love him. But no human language, not even St. Paul's is adequate to describe the glory, beauty and delights of our heavenly home.'"¹

We come now to the end of our study of mystic prayer—the transfiguration of the entire man, body and soul—by divine light, the brightness of Christ and the Holy Spirit, the glorious reflexion of the Most Holy Trinity. By grace man's nature becomes changed. The darkness of material things fades and is lit up by the Holy Spirit.

This is but the end of our prayer on earth, a foretaste of vision in the world to come. The end of mystic prayer means the cessation of time. The release of all creation from being slaves to corruption so as to have a share in the freedom of the sons of God. The experience of those who have practised the prayer of Jesus should urge us towards the light of eternal day which is dawning even now could we but recognize the signs.

E. BEHR-SIGEL (translated by C.B.).

The writer of this article is a member of the Orthodox Church. We have not given all the footnotes as in the original article but only such as refer to quotations. In two cases we have referred to English translations.

As the author tells us the constant use of the prayer of Jesus as here described is specially for monks and nuns ; but just as in the West the works of St. John of the Cross are used and his method practised by Catholics living in the world so it would seem is this spiritual prayer practised by the ordinary Orthodox laypeople. And it is very good that it is so.—THE EDITOR.

¹ Semeur, op. cit., pp. 285-6. Cf. re transfiguration, vid. V. Lossky ; *supra*, p. 225. (Paris, 1945).

THE DIVINE OFFICE IN THE BYZANTINE RITE

INTRODUCTION. Of the making of books on the Byzantine Liturgy there seems to be no end ; translations abound in every shape and form and in most of the Western languages but very little indeed has been written on the Divine Office. True, most works dealing with the Eastern Churches mention it and some give a short outline of the Hours ; there are three or four English translations of parts but these are out of print. Of these versions one bearing the title *Office for the Lord's Day as prescribed by the Orthodox Church* was issued from the Greek Church, Bristol and was the work of S. G. Hatherley, Mus.B. (Oxon), Archpriest of the Patriarchal Œcumenical Throne of Constantinople ; the preface, dated 25th August 1880, has the statement that the volume "has the sanction and blessing of His late-All-Holiness Joakeim II." This volume contains everything variable that can occur on any Sunday in the year for both the Divine Office and the Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil : it also gives those parts which will be used on Sundays on which any of the nine Greater Feasts may fall¹.

The Byzantine Office for 29th June 1880 was published by Cope and Fenwick in 1909, and is a compilation giving the whole Office for the Sunday on which the feast of SS. Peter and Paul fell in that year (1880) : the editor was Rev. J. B. Wainewright.²

A third work is *The Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic and Apostolic Church* compiled by Isabel Hapgood and published in several editions in New York, the copy in the writer's

¹ It is interesting to note in the preface that this translation had been promised by the Editor fifteen years earlier (1865) and that he claimed to be "the father of the small scattered band of English professing the Orthodox faith." Who were these English folk ? I have been told that there was a small Greek church—a "tin" one—in Bristol in the middle of the last century, but an afternoon's search in the Central Library of that city failed to produce any evidence of its existence. A census of church attendance taken on a Sunday of 1881 mentions many churches (including the four Catholic ones of that period) but has no reference to a Greek Orthodox chapel or church. The writer bought his copy of the book from a secondhand bookstall in Bristol for threepence many years ago, he will not lend it !

² The Catholic Central Library, Wilfred Street, S.W.1, has a copy of Wainewright's book.

possession has an endorsement from the Russian Patriarch Tikhon dated 3rd November 1921. Miss Hapgood's book is based entirely on the Russian Service Books and Uses and is hard to follow (Fortescue, in the introduction to his translation of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, published for the Eucharistic Congress in London in 1908 says of this book: "Not good, the author knows neither theology nor liturgy, and her style is preposterous.")

Parts of the Divine Office appear in English in some of the prayer books published for Byzantine Catholics in America but they give little except the bare minimum of the variable parts and none of the secret prayers.

For those who can follow the actual Greek text and are content to do without the secret prayers, the well-known *Synekdemos* can be recommended: in addition to the variable parts of the Divine Liturgy it gives the proper for the Divine Office for Sundays and the great feasts, the whole of Holy Week, and a large number of private devotions; it does however assume that the user is sufficiently well acquainted with the structure of the Office to be able to fit the variable parts into their proper places. A well-printed edition, published in New York, is obtainable from the Greek Cathedral in London.

To complete the list of books, mention should be made of a form of "Ordo recitandi," the *Emerologion* which was published in Athens before the war and which appears to be intended for the laity.¹

In the articles which follow it is proposed to give first, some account of the liturgical books, definitions of the variable parts which feature so largely in all Byzantine Offices, and a note on the Kalendar before proceeding to describe the structure of the Hours as they are usually recited. For much of the information which follows the writer is indebted to the translations by the Archpriest Hatherley and the Rev. J. B. Wainewright, to an article by Father Benedict Zimmerman, O.D.C., which appeared in *The Month* in 1893.² The first two volumes of Père Abel Couturier's *Cours de Liturgie Grecque-Melkite* have however formed the principal source from which the writer has derived his information; the articles, then, describe the practice—more traditional and more in conformity

¹ The writer has seen the 1939 edition through the kindness of the Rev. Ronald Pilkington.

² Acknowledgment of the kindness of the present Editor of *The Month* in permitting use to be made of this article is gratefully made.—EDITOR.

with the old Service Books than the present-day practice of the Greek Orthodox of Constantinople and Athens—of the Uniate Melkites of Syria, Palestine and Egypt.¹

2. *The Liturgical Books.* Except in a small degree among the Uniates, the clergy and faithful of the Byzantine rite have no “compendium” books corresponding to our Missal, Breviary, Rituale, Pontificale and Caeremoniale Episcoporum : they retain the ancient use of a number of books, each intended for a specific individual, the celebrant, the deacon, the lector, the choir. With this distinction in mind, the following list of liturgical books is not so formidable as it may seem (one should remember also that, unlike our practice, the celebrant in the Byzantine rite does not say *sotto voce* all the things, the Epistle and Gospel, for example, that the Western celebrant is bound to read).

Euchologion. This contains the fixed parts of the three Liturgies (St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil and the Liturgy of the Presanctified), the priest’s and deacon’s secret prayers and litanies, the Order of Administration of all the Sacraments, a large number of blessings and finally the Kalendar.

Hieratikon and Liturgikon are for general use by the celebrant and deacon at the altar ; they contain the secret prayers, litanies, and a few blessings, in a word they are handy extracts from the Euchologion.

Evangelion contains the Gospels to be read in the Liturgy and Office.

Apostolos contains the extracts (pericopes) from the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles read in the Liturgy and Office.

Horologion contains the prayers of the Office and certain principal parts (the Apolytikia and Kontakia) for each day.²

Psalter contains the 150 psalms of David divided into twenty sections called Kathismata, each section is sub-divided into three parts called Staseis.

Menaion might be compared to a combination of our Proper Lessons for the second nocturn on fixed feasts and the Martyrology : it contains the proper of the fixed feasts and has one volume for each month of the year.

¹ In effect, there are but minor differences of small account.

² Sometimes mistakenly referred as a breviary, it might be called “*Horae diurnae*” if one is content to use a separate psalter.

Paraklitiki contains the parts of the Office proper to the Season—the Proprium de Tempore, if you like. It is divided into eight sections, one for each musical Tone; each section comprises the proper for a week.

Oktoichos. As its name implies, this book carries the eight Tones. It is an extract from the *Paraklitiki* containing the eight offices proper to the Sundays which are not covered by the next two books to be mentioned.

Triodion contains the proper “de tempore” from the Sunday of the Pharisee and the Publican (10th before Easter) to Holy Saturday, both inclusive.

Pentecostarion continues the *Triodion* with the proper of Sundays and movable feasts of our Lord from the Holy and Great Pasch (Easter Sunday) to the Sunday of All Saints (our Trinity Sunday) both inclusive.¹

Typikon is a sort of perpetual Ordo containing the rules for the celebration of the principal feasts under every condition of concurrence and occurrence that can happen; the Paschal Tables, ceremonial for the Blessing of Chrism by the Œcumenical Patriarch and some other special and rare ceremonies are given. This book is a wealth of information and interest, unfortunately there are serious discrepancies between editions both Orthodox and Melkite. The detailed instructions to cover every eventuality are well illustrated in those which deal with the feast of the Annunciation of Our Blessed Lady (25th March) which can fall on any day commencing with the Friday in the third week of Lent (with the Vigil on the Thursday) to the Tuesday after Easter Sunday, they occupy thirty-four closely printed quarto pages. St. George (25th April) whose feast can fall between Holy Saturday and the Thursday in the third week after Easter Sunday requires thirteen pages!

3. *The Eight Modes or Tones*. It is necessary to consider the eight Tones (ἑῡχοι) if a full understanding of the arrangement of the “de Tempore” is to be obtained. The following Table gives the comparison between the Byzantine and Gregorian numbering:

¹ The Uniate Melkites have extended this book to include the feast of Corpus Christi (with a vigil) and its Octave: their Office for this feast is in Arabic only and is said to date back to 1264, but the feast did not obtain its present solemnity until 1732 when a plague then raging in Aleppo ceased during the Octave. The present proper was approved by the Sacred Council of Propaganda on 3rd January 1746.

| | <i>Greek</i> <i>Number.</i> | <i>Byzantine</i> <i>Number.</i> | <i>Gregorian</i> <i>Number.</i> |
|--------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Α' | First | First |
| | Β' | Second | Third |
| | Γ' | Third | Fifth |
| | Δ' | Fourth | Seventh |
| πλ. Α' | (1st Plagal) | Fifth | Second |
| πλ. Β' | (2nd Plagal) | Sixth | Fourth |
| | Βαρύς | Seventh | Sixth |
| πλ. Δ' | (4th Plagal) | Eighth | Eighth |

The series of Tones commences each year with the first (Α') on the Sunday of St. Thomas (our Low Sunday): it begins at Vespers on the previous Saturday evening and is used for all the "de Tempore" proper (with one or two exceptions which will be noted when they occur) until the following Saturday when the next Tone (Β') is taken up, and so on until Palm Sunday of the next year. Easter Sunday, being the Feast of Feasts, does not come into the Tone-cycle.

4. *The Variable Parts of the Divine Office.* Just as the weekly recitation of the Psalter is the principal feature of the Divine Office in the Western rites, so in the Byzantine rite it is, in theory at least (with the necessity of a twice weekly recital in Lent) but in practice, outside of the strictest monasteries, the *cursus* is very much neglected, certain psalms which have an intimate connexion with the Hour which is being sung are almost the only ones which are not omitted and even they may be curtailed. The reason for this treatment of the Psalter would seem to be the importance attached to compositions of ecclesiastical origin, the troparia, the Odes of the numerous Canons with their frequent repetitions of some parts, and the continual litanies, ektenies and other diaconal prayers.

It has already been said that the 150 psalms are divided into Kathismata and Staseis; the division is shown in the following Table:

| <i>Day</i> <i>of the</i> <i>Week.</i> | <i>Kathisma.</i> | <i>1st Stasis.</i> | <i>2nd Stasis.</i> | <i>3rd Stasis.</i> |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Sunday | 1 | 1 - 3 | 4 - 6 | 7 - 8 |
| | 2 | 9 - 10 | 11 - 13 | 14 - 16 |
| | 3 | 17 - | 18 - 20 | 21 - 23 |
| Monday | 4 | 24 - 26 | 27 - 29 | 30 - 31 |
| | 5 | 32 - 33 | 34 - 35 | 36 - |
| | 6 | 37 - 39 | 40 - 42 | 43 - 45 |

| <i>Day of the Week</i> | <i>Kathisma.</i> | <i>1st Stasis.</i> | <i>2nd Stasis.</i> | <i>3rd Stasis.</i> |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Tuesday | 7 | 46 - 48 | 49 - 50 | 51 - 54 |
| | 8 | 55 - 57 | 58 - 60 | 61 - 63 |
| | 9 | 64 - 66 | 67 - | 68 - 69 |
| Wednesday | 10 | 70 - 71 | 72 - 73 | 74 - 76 |
| | 11 | 77 - | 78 - 80 | 81 - 84 |
| | 12 | 85 - 87 | 88 - | 89 - 90 |
| Thursday | 13 | 91 - 93 | 94 - 96 | 97 - 100 |
| | 14 | 101 - 102 | 103 - | 104 - |
| | 15 | 105 - | 106 - | 107 - 108 |
| Saturday | 16 | 109 - 111 | 112 - 114 | 115 - 117 |
| | 17 | Ps. 118 1-72 | 73 - 131 | 132-end |
| Friday | 18 | 119 - 123 | 124 - 128 | 129 - 133 |
| | 19 | 134 - 136 | 137 - 139 | 140 - 142 |
| | 20 | 143 - 144 | 145 - 147 | 148 - 150 |

The group of Psalms 140, 141, 129 and 116 is known as the *Κύριε ἐκέκραξα* from the opening words of Psalm 140, they are always sung at Vespers.

The six Psalms 3, 37, 62, 87, 102 and 142 form the *Ἑξάψαλμος* and are sung at the beginning of the Daybreak Office.

Psalms 148, 149 and 150 are sung as the morning psalms and may be compared to the same group which was formerly sung at Lauds before the reform of the Roman Psalter in 1911.

Psalm 103 is the Invitatory Psalm at Vespers.

Canticles. Nine canticles, taken from the Books of the Old and New Testaments are used as the bases of the Canons which occur in the Morning Office.

Readings of Prophecies, certain extracts from the Catholic Epistles and the four Gospels are the only other scriptural components of the Divine Office.

The Canons are rhythmical compositions consisting of *Odes*, which are divided into *troparia*: the majority of Canons are written in some form of acrostic such as an alphabetical one or in some cases a line which gives the clue to the author's name or bears on the subject matter of the feast itself. A Canon which treats of the Resurrection of our Lord is called *ἀναστάσιμος*, one which hymns His Crucifixion is *σταυρώσιμος*, the Blessed Trinity are extolled in *τριαδικός*, and so on.

The Odes of which the Canons are composed form a series of *troparia* based on one or other of the Canticles of Holy

Scripture : their number may be 2, 3, 4 or 9 (the Triodion, mentioned in paragraph two, receives its name from the large number of Canons of three Odes which it contains).

A *Troparion* is a short composition of ecclesiastical origin, having a rhythmic law which follows the tonic accent. Troparia have various names which indicate their purport or their place in the Divine Office so that a knowledge of the meaning of those names most commonly to be met with in the liturgical books is necessary for a proper understanding of the variable parts of the Office.

In the Canons some or all of the following kinds of troparia may be found : the *Hirmos*, the first troparion of each Ode, from which those that follow take their rhythm and chant : the *Doxastikon*, in two troparia which end each Ode, the Δόξα πατρί precedes the first, the καὶ νῦν the second, which is called the *Theotokion* or *Stavrotheotokion*, the former if it sings of our Lady only, the latter if it commemorates her at the foot of the Cross. The *Katavasia* is a *hirmos* which is repeated at the end of each Ode on the greater feasts. The *Megalynaria* (so called because they commence with the word μεγαλύνον, are sung alternately with the troparia of the ninth Ode (often the *Magnificat*). *Kathisma* is a troparion followed by a theotokion said after the third Ode : it is also the title of the group of Troparia which follow the Kathismata of the Psalter at *Orthros*.

The *Hypakoi* precedes the Kathisma of the third Ode on Sundays and the greater feasts. The *Kondakion* is a summary of the subject of the feast of the day and is said after the sixth Ode, at the Little Hours and in the Liturgy. The *Ikos*, longer than the other Troparia, is said after the Kondakion of the sixth Ode and before the *Synaxarion*, the equivalent of the lessons of the second nocturn of the Roman Breviary. Finally, the *Exapostilarion* concludes the Canon : it is replaced by the *Photagogikon* in Lent.

The most important Troparia used outside the Canon are : *Stichera*, sung between verses of the Psalms at Vespers and Orthros, are divided into four classes ; *Prosomia*, notable both for their length and their melody ; *Idiomela*, having their own melody ; *Martyrika*, which invoke the Holy Martyrs ; *Anatolika* (called also *Anastasima*), which celebrate the Resurrection. *Apostikha*, a series of Troparia preceded by a verse of a psalm, are said at Vespers and Orthros.

Evlogitaria follow the exclamation Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, κύριε, at Orthros on Sundays and Saturdays. The *Eothinon* is the doxastikon of the psalms of Orthros on Sundays: they are eleven in number, thus corresponding to the Dawn Gospels.

Lastly, the *Apolytikion*, the principal Troparion of the day or feast, forms the conclusion of Vespers and the other Hours, and is sung before the Little Entry in the Holy Liturgy.¹

D. C. MCPHERSON

(to be continued)

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

The aim of this chronicle is specially to give the trends of events.—EDITOR.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

TRENDS AND EVENTS, JANUARY 1946 TO MARCH 1947.²

GENERAL.

An academic lecture delivered at a recent important public function of the Orthodox Church in Russia bore the seemingly innocuous title, *The last period of St. Alexander Nevsky's life and work and his attitude to the Tartars*. According to the official account in the *J.M.P.*, "the speaker emphasized the spirit of self-denial animating St. Alexander, whose one purpose in life was to save Russia which was with difficulty recovering from the havoc wrought by the Tartar invasion from a recurrence of this calamity, and who wore himself to a premature death in constant endeavours to preserve peace with the Tartar conquerors, a peace which he knew to be vitally necessary to the Russia of his time."

Grand Duke Alexander Yaroslavich Nevsky (d. 1263), later canonized by the Russian Church, reigned at a time when the very existence of the Orthodox Church and of the Russian nation stood in dire peril. Convinced of the futility of, and of grave risks involved in, any active resistance to the over-

¹ The author wishes to express his indebtedness to the excellent chapter on the Canons and Troparia which appears in Père Couturier's second volume (mentioned in paragraph 1) for the foregoing definitions.

² Based on the admirable chronicle of events in the Catholic *Cahiers de Russie et Chrétienté*, Paris, No. 2, 1947 (subsequently quoted as *R. et C.*) and on the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* (subsequently quoted as *J.M.P.*)

whelming power of the infidels, Alexander deliberately chose the path of collaboration and appeasement, a policy which brought in its wake bitter humiliation at the hands of the Mongols and acrimonious reproaches and accusations from the "resistance party." Yet, in the long run, Alexander's policy proved to have been wise and farsighted: the Church and the nation escaped destruction, and two centuries later the Mongol yoke was cast off.

Was the lecturer's choice of subject accidental, or was it another case of *Lettres Persanes*? We cannot know, but the situation today bears such resemblance to the thirteenth century scene, that it might well have served as an argument in favour of the line chosen by (or, perhaps, imposed by necessity on) the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church today.

Two main points emerge from an analysis of the meagre sources available for the investigation of church affairs in the Soviet Union. On the credit side stands the overriding fact of the continued existence and rapid growth of the hierarchical structure of the Church, which, though closely supervised by the *régime*, is standing entirely outside the general framework of the body politic. No other institution in the Soviet Union enjoys a privilege comparable to that which has been granted to the Orthodox Church. Her existence as an autonomous organization governed by laws and pursuing aims different from those of the rest of the state-controlled society, is the only flaw in the otherwise complete totalitarian pattern. The psychological effect of this unique achievement on the people is of an inestimable value. So are, of course, the broader flow of sacramental grace and other spiritual benefits having their origin in this achievement.

Against this must be set the price paid by the Church for this concession on the part of the *régime*. For pay she must, though we have no ways of knowing the precise terms. Enough circumstantial evidence, however, is available to indicate at least the domains in which the Church was forced to agree to collaborate with the *régime*. Soviet foreign policy, notably in Central and South-Eastern Europe, for instance, and the efforts made by the Russian Orthodox Church in that field, appear to be co-ordinated to a certain extent. Official and ecclesiastical polemics against the Catholic Church are carried on roughly on the same lines. Inside the country, Church leaders go out of their way to protest their loyalty to, and their sympathy with, the aims of the Soviet Govern-

ment, insofar as they do not affect the dogmatic and canonical purity of the Church.

The future will show, whether or not the Patriarchal Church was right in coming to an understanding with the inherently atheistic Soviet *régime*. Be it as it may, we, living in a happier political and spiritual climate, must take into consideration the tragic background of this development in passing judgment on actions and public pronouncements of Russian Church leaders. Normal standards are only partly applicable to men who, living in surroundings which are more reminiscent of the Antichrist's rule than any other modern form of human society, are animated by the sincere desire to save from utter destruction what they believe to be the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS.

One of the most gratifying recent achievements has been the partial restoration of theological instruction. The salient facts are these: In 1944 a Theological Institute and Courses of Pastoral Theology were opened in Moscow with the express permission of the Government. Two years later, the Church was able to convert them respectively into an Ecclesiastical Academy, starting modestly with fourteen students divided into two courses, and a seminary with 147 students divided into three courses. A similar change took place in Leningrad, where the Courses of Pastoral Theology opened in November 1945 were transformed in October 1946 into a seminary with fifty-eight students and an Ecclesiastical Academy with sixteen students. Similar establishments on a smaller scale have been opened in a number of provincial dioceses, notably in Odessa.

Monastic life is also reviving. Among the ninety odd, mostly very small monasteries and convents known to exist, are three venerable establishments, the Pecherskaya Lavra in Kiev, the Pochaev Monastery in Wolynia, and the Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra near Moscow. From April 1946 on, monks and faithful have been once again able to pray at the shrine of St. Sergius of Radonezh in the last named Lavra. Patriarch Alexius visited it at Whitsun. Pilgrimages to this sanctuary have been taking place regularly. The Lavra counts at present thirty-five monks, mostly elderly men. The general monastery rule stipulates that monks must perform work useful not only to their communities, but also to the population in the neighbourhood (market gardening, various workshops, etc.).

As to parochial life, information is largely confined to Moscow, where thirty-five churches are open. Restoration of several others is anticipated, but the plans must be co-ordinated with the general reconstruction scheme. Attendance at all services is said to be strong. Two liturgies are often celebrated on Sundays, a departure from the usual custom, and communion is said to last several hours at each liturgy. Confession is setting the gravest problem owing to the large number of penitents and shortage of priests. When still metropolitan of Leningrad, the present patriarch instructed the clergy to do all they can to safeguard auricular confession and advised them that in cases when collective (silent) confession became inevitable, every penitent was to be given a chance of making a short oral avowal of sins at the chalice.¹ Large numbers of the faithful have been asking for the administration of the sacraments of baptism and marriage, in many cases years after the birth of the child or the civil ceremony.

While for many years past, the clergy was unable to preach, a priest who would at present fail to instruct his parishioners by means of sermons at all services, would be viewed by them as falling short of his duty. All Moscow parish priests preach in rotation in the Patriarchal Epiphany Cathedral. Sermons preached by Metropolitan Nicholas (entirely unpolitical in their contents in pleasant contrast with many of his war-time pronouncements) form a regular feature of the *J.M.P.*

Official relations between the Patriarchal Church and the Soviet Government remain cordial. It should be noted that officially the Church has nothing whatever to do with the Communist Party; she deals only with the Special Council attached to the Cabinet and its commissioners in the provinces. This Government body headed by G. G. Karpov, a Communist, closely supervises all activities of the Church. Karpov himself is either personally present or is represented at all important public functions of the Church, such as meetings with ecclesiastical delegations coming from abroad, opening of educational establishments, re-opening of churches, etc. A closely-knit network of local branches of this Council performs similar functions in provincial dioceses.

In August 1946 the patriarch was rewarded "for his outstanding merits in organizing patriotic work during the war" with the Order of the Red Banner of Labour. Earlier, the same year, Mgr. Luke, archbishop of Tambov and Michurinsk

¹ i.e. at the time of receiving Holy Communion.—EDITOR.

(since translated to the See of Simferopol and the Crimea), in lay life Professor V. Voino-Yasenetsky, a celebrated surgeon, received one of the coveted R.100,000 Stalin prizes, distributed annually for outstanding achievements in science and art. A large number of priests, eighty-six in the Moscow Province alone, received war medals in recognition of "their prowess in work during the war."

The number of dioceses is steadily growing. Apart from the three Metropolitan Sees (Krutitsy, Leningrad and Kiev), the following fifty-four diocesan sees within the new borders of the U.S.S.R. were mentioned in the *J.M.P.* during the period under review: Alma-Ata and Kazakhstan; Archangel; Astrakhan and Stalingrad; Cheboksary and Chuvashia; Chernigov and Nezhin; Dmitrov; Chkalov and Buzuluk; Dnepropetrovsk and Zaporozhye; Donetsk and Voroshilovgrad; Gorky and Arzamas; Grodno and Baranowicze; Irkutsk; Ivanovo and Shuya; Izhevsk and Udmurtia; Izmail and Bolgrad; Kaluga; Kamenets-Podolsk and Proskurov; Kazan; Khabarovsk and Vladivostok; Kherson and Nikolaev; Kirovograd and Chigirin; Kishinev and Moldavia; Kostroma and Galich; Kuibyshev and Syzran; Kursk and Belgorod; Lwów and Tarnopol; Lyskovo; Minsk and Belorussia; Molotov; Mozhaisk; Mukačevo and Uzhorod; Novosibirsk and Barnaul; Odessa; Omsk and Tara; Orel and Bryansk; Pinsk and Brest; Rostov-on-Don and Taganrog; Ryazan and Kasimov; Sambor and Drohobycz; Saratov and Volsk; Simferopol and the Crimea; Stanislawów and Kolomyja; Sverdlovsk and Chelyabinsk; Tambov and Michurinsk; Tashkent and Central Asia; Tula and Belev; Ulyanovsk and Melekess; Uman; Velikie Luki and Toropets; Wilno; Vinnitsa and Bratslav; Wolyn and Rowne; Yaroslavl and Rostov; Zhitomir.

The list is necessarily incomplete.

At least twelve bishops were consecrated during the period under review.

THE SEE OF MOSCOW AND THE RUSSIAN DIASPORA.

Among the Russian Orthodox abroad, the crisis hinging on the problem of relations with the Moscow patriarchate and, hence, indirectly, with the Soviet Government, shows no signs of abating, although a certain measure of crystallization has by now followed the initial confusion. As to deeper realities underlying this crisis, we cannot do better than quote the editorial opinion of *R. et C.* (p. 53):

It would be highly superficial to reduce the conflict within the Russian Orthodox Church abroad to a simple rivalry of political interests. This Church, now passing through a very difficult stage of her historical evolution, is looking out for solutions to a number of burning questions, such as the necessity of finding a canonically sound status for Orthodox communities in a number of countries, where in the past Orthodoxy had but a few isolated representatives. The emigration which gave birth to these communities is ceasing to be an emigration. It is evolving into elements of population half-assimilated to their surroundings, which, even though they remain faithful to their ancestral faith, will soon have nothing Russian about them except their origin.

“How are these churches to constitute themselves, on an ethnical or on a geographical basis? How are they to be incorporated canonically into the general structure of other Orthodox churches? What is to be their relationship with their Mother-Church? What measure of authority are they to concede to other Patriarchal sees, notably to the Œcumenical See of Constantinople? On what principles are they to base their own organization? What balance, from the point of view of discipline, is to be struck within these folds between the clerical element, particularly the episcopacy, and the lay element? In other words, is their constitution to develop on ‘authoritarian’ or ‘democratic’ lines?”

These deeper issues involved in the present disputes seem to have been perceived clearer than elsewhere by the Russian Orthodox in U.S.A., where the Orthodox community bears a character quite different from that of Russian communities in France and in Europe generally.

As distinct from Orthodox Russian parishes in Europe which were founded in response to religious needs of Russians who left their country after the 1917 revolution, Russian parishes in U.S.A. and Canada count a large number of faithful who have never been *émigrés* in the now accepted sense of political refugees. Many of these Russians emigrated to America long before the first World War. Those compatriots of theirs who found refuge in North America after the revolution found there an established and well-organized Russian church, the American province of the Russian church.

After the revolution, the Russian church in America went through similar periods of conflicts, as the churches in Europe. In 1933 a small fraction submitted itself to the patriarchate of Moscow and Metropolitan Benjamin (Fedchenko) was ap-

pointed Patriarchal Exarch in America. The majority, however, remained under the authority of Metropolitan Plato, and, after his death, under that of his successor, Metropolitan Theophilos. In 1935 this group joined the jurisdiction of the Episcopal Synod of Karlovtsy, while preserving a large measure of authority.

It is important to realize that Russian *émigrés* in the United States have progressed further on the road of assimilation to their surroundings than the *émigrés* in European countries. Most of them have by now acquired American citizenship and, with it, the characteristically American national feeling, a development which has accentuated their desire for ecclesiastical independence. This psychological aspect seems to have been completely overlooked by the Patriarchal Church in her approach to the Russian Orthodox in America.

Consequently, when in 1945 the Moscow patriarchate made public its terms for a reconciliation of the American church with her mother church, the Russian Orthodox bishops in U.S.A. saw themselves compelled to reject them and decided to submit the whole question to a Pan-American Church Council. It would seem that this rejection was caused more by the manner in which the Patriarchal Church approached the American church, than by a hostility of principle towards the Moscow patriarchate. A political misunderstanding, later cleared up, aggravated the issue: the patriarch declared that clergy belonging to his jurisdiction were forbidden to discuss Russian politics. In reply, Metropolitan Theophilos pointed out that this stipulation was inapplicable to American conditions. "We are," he said, "American and not Soviet citizens, and the patriarchate of Moscow cannot give us orders which would restrict our constitutional rights."

The Council was held in Cleveland in November 1946. A substantial majority of its members expressed itself in favour of a middle course, that is, it advocated the formation of an autonomous American church, the severance of all links with the Synod of Munich (the late Synod of Karlovtsy) and the recognition of a purely nominal jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchate.¹ The decision of the Council was communicated to Moscow. Surprisingly, the patriarch replied in a conciliatory tone, saying that "in principle he had no objection to the autonomy of our Orthodox Church in America." Mgr. Gregory, metropolitan of Leningrad and

¹ A full summary of the Council's resolution was published in *E.C.Q.*, January-March issue 1947.

Novgorod, said the Patriarch, would shortly go to America to examine the whole problem with the American episcopate "in a spirit of peace." That is where matters rest at present, Mgr. Gregory's visit having not yet materialized.

So far, there has been no *rapprochement* in U.S.A. between Mgr. Benjamin's and Mgr. Theophilos's branches, but the situation may change after the final settlement of the reunion question. As to the third group which has been consistently refusing any dealings with Moscow, it continues under the jurisdiction of the Munich Synod.

Events in Western Europe naturally centre on Paris, the Alexandria of the Russian diaspora. The main facts up to the end of 1945 will be familiar to readers of the *E.C.Q.* from the article by Fr. Paul Maillieux, S.J., in the April-June issue of 1946. Let us recall that the Paris visit of Metropolitan Nicholas in August-September 1945 resulted at first in a complete reunion of all three factions of the exiled Russian church in France under the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchate. This union proved to be ephemeral. It was held together largely by the efforts of the aged and ailing Metropolitan Eulogius, while a more reserved attitude was maintained from the beginning by many people in his immediate *entourage*, particularly by the professorial staff of the Theological Institute. It was generally expected that the whole reunion issue would be revived should anything happen to the metropolitan.

In anticipation of these coming difficulties, the Moscow patriarchate endeavoured in vain to obtain from the French Government a permanent visa for Mgr. Photius, archbishop of Orel and Bryansk, to act as vicar of Mgr. Eulogius. It was only after the latter's death, in August 1946, that two Moscow hierarchs, Mgr. Photius and Mgr. Gregory, metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, were allowed to come to Paris for a temporary stay. Simultaneously with their arrival, the Moscow patriarchate issued a statement repudiating all the claims of Constantinople on Russian Orthodox parishes in Western Europe. It also announced the appointment of Metropolitan Seraphim, a hierarch who, up to 1945, belonged to the Karlovtsy Synod, and whose political record during the war was criticized by many Russians, to the post of the Patriarchal Exarch of Western Europe. Both decisions were communicated to Constantinople.

It will be remembered that when the late Metropolitan Eulogius accepted the title of Moscow Exarch, he did so in

anticipation of a speedy release from the Constantinople jurisdiction under which his parishes had been since 1931. Yet no such release came from Constantinople either before or after the metropolitan's death. The situation was thus rather confused, with the Russian churches in Western Europe being simultaneously under two jurisdictions, canonically an untenable position. Another element of confusion was introduced by the publication of a will drawn up by Metropolitan Eulogius in which he entrusted Archbishop Vladimir, a bishop belonging to his jurisdiction, with the administration of the churches. The will was made in 1943 and obviously referred to the war situation, but in the absence of any later document it retained its value in 1946.

The decision of the Moscow patriarchate to put an end to the exiled church's dependence on the See of Constantinople, taken as it was without any previous consultation and without accounting for the complex situation abroad, met accordingly with a determined opposition on the part of Archbishop Vladimir who was energetically supported by the larger part of his clergy and laity, particularly by the teaching staff of the Theological Institute. Before communicating his decision to the patriarch of Moscow, Mgr. Vladimir called a special Diocesan Assembly to pronounce on this matter. The assembly held in Paris in October 1946, to which only those members of the clergy and parish delegates were admitted who were in favour of remaining within the jurisdiction of Constantinople, endorsed Archbishop Vladimir's stand. The two Moscow hierarchs, then in Paris, tried in vain to dissuade Mgr. Vladimir from refusing to comply with the Moscow patriarchate's instructions.

The situation such as it emerged after these events and as it stands at present has curiously enough reverted to the old tri-partite division, which existed among the Russian Orthodox abroad before the abortive 1945 reunion and which seems to reflect certain permanent intellectual and political divisions within the Russian emigration.

There is the "left wing" which has submitted itself unconditionally to the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchate. Its head, Metropolitan Seraphim, visited Moscow in February 1947, where he was cordially received and entertained by the patriarchate.

There is the "right wing," maintaining its links with the Synod of Munich (the successor of the Karlovtsy Synod). In France it is led by an energetic young bishop, Mgr.

Nathaniel. Finally there is the large centre group, numerically the strongest of the three, grouped around Archbishop Vladimir, the Theological Institute and the rue Daru Cathedral. Its position has been greatly consolidated by the receipt of an official message from the Œcumenical Patriarch (March 1947) confirming Archbishop Vladimir in his post as Exarch of the Œcumenical See for Russian parishes in Western Europe.

This division extends to all centres of the Russian diaspora in Europe, including the Western zones of Germany and Austria, where the Munich bishops are particularly active in their missionary work among the Displaced Persons.

So far, the Moscow patriarchate has withheld the application of any canonical sanctions to what it terms Mgr. Vladimir's "rebellion."

R. *et C.* is of the opinion that the opposition to the See of Moscow on the part of the majority of the Russian Orthodox Church in France is caused less by a hostility in principle, than by the concern to preserve the liberty of research and theological thought, which, it is feared, might be jeopardized by a too close dependence on the patriarchate, itself under pressure from the civil power of the Soviet Government.

It may be permitted to add that had the issue of the reunion been handled more carefully in 1945, had the Orthodox Church in France acted on the same lines as the Orthodox Church in U.S.A., these apprehensions might have easily been allayed.

In the Far East, another large centre of the Russian emigration, the situation appears to be more clearcut. All Orthodox hierarchs in Manchuria and China proper, with the exception of Mgr. John, bishop of Shanghai, who remains within the Munich jurisdiction, have joined the Moscow jurisdiction.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Strong and on the whole successful efforts were made during the period under review by the See of Moscow to extend and consolidate its influence on other Orthodox Churches in Eastern Europe. Only a brief summary is possible here.

Negotiations about a possible transfer of the Finnish Orthodox Church from the Constantinople to the Moscow jurisdiction are in progress. In October 1946, Mgr. Geranios, head of the Finnish church, visited Moscow, but a final decision has not been taken yet, the two obstacles being

the reluctance of the Œcumenical patriarchate to release the Finnish church from its jurisdiction and the opposition of a large part of Mgr. Germano's Finnish flock to any move likely to make their Church dependent on the Russian patriarchate. Russian parishes in Finland are already administered by the metropolitan of Leningrad.

A visit of a delegation of the Czech Orthodox Church to Moscow in January 1946 resulted ultimately in the incorporation of this orthodox community into the Russian church (April 1946). Up to that time, this numerically very weak church belonged to the jurisdiction of the Serb Patriarch. Mgr. Eleutherius, formerly archbishop of Rostov and Taganrog, was appointed Patriarchal Exarch for Czechoslovakia with his residence in Prague. Later in the year, G. Karpov, Chairman of the Soviet Government Council for Orthodox Church Affairs, visited Prague, where he was fêted both by Church dignitaries and civil authorities.

In Austria the Moscow patriarchate, greatly assisted by Soviet occupation authorities, established a new episcopal see, an *émigré* Bishop, Mgr. Sergius, having been translated to Vienna from Prague. About a score of parishes in the Western zones on the other hand, are administered by the Munich Synod.

In August 1946 Mgr. Nestor, bishop of Uzhorod and Mukačevo (that is, of the church in Subcarpathian Russia, which, like the Czech Orthodox Church, has been incorporated into the Russian Church) visited Hungary. The Orthodox in Hungary, both Magyars and Rumanians, wanted to come under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchal Church, but asked to be administered by a Hungarian bishop. In the course of Mgr. Nestor's talks it was decided, however, that the Hungarian church would come under a Russian bishop, assisted by a Hungarian suffragan.

Cordial relations with the Bulgarian church continued throughout 1946, and in May Patriarch Alexius visited this country on the occasion of the millenary celebrations in honour of St. John of Ryla, the national saint of Bulgaria. Press articles, official pronouncements and sermons made public during and after this visit stressed both the political and the religious importance of this occasion.

Little is known on relations between the Patriarchal Churches of Moscow and of Serbia. It will be recalled that a Serb delegation was present at the enthronization of Patriarch Alexius. At that time, Patriarch Gabriel was still deported

by the Germans, and in his absence Mgr. Joseph, Metropolitan of Skoplje headed the Serb church. In February-March 1946, a delegation of the Russian church, headed by Mgr. Sergius, bishop of Kirovograd and Chigirin, went to Belgrade "on matters of common interest to the churches of Russia and Serbia." It received a most cordial welcome from the authorities. The long official account in the *J.M.P.* is very uncommunicative on the results, if any, of this journey.

R. *et C.* thinks that the Serb church offered no opposition to the incorporation of the Czech church into the Moscow patriarchate, but that difficulties may exist between the two churches in connexion with the expulsion of Serb bishops from Macedonia and their replacement by Bulgarian hierarchs. The Moscow patriarchate may be exercising its influence in favour of the Bulgarians in this respect.

On 14th November 1946, Patriarch Gabriel returned to Belgrade. To quote the same review: "It was known that after his liberation he had refused to return to his country, as he disapproved of anti-religious measures taken by the Tito Government. His sudden return to Belgrade was, therefore, a veritable *coup de théâtre* and there are many conjectures as to reasons or influences which induced him to change his attitude so suddenly and so radically. One can only note that the Patriarch's attitude towards his Government seems to correspond to the attitude of the patriarch of Moscow towards the Soviet Government. It is highly probable that the Moscow patriarchate exercised its influence to induce Patriarch Gabriel to return to Yugoslavia."

Patriarch Nicodemus of Rumania visited Moscow in October 1946 where he was received with great cordiality.

R. *et C.* sums up its review of the relations of the Russian church with other orthodox churches in countries belonging to the Soviet zone of influence in these words:

"The Moscow patriarchate shows an undeniable desire to exercise an effective influence on individual national churches and tries to render an organic character to this influence by establishing links of a juridical nature. It will be of interest to watch the future development of this trend which cannot possibly leave indifferent the patriarchate of Constantinople."

RELATIONS WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Apart from the attempts to unmake the Union in Galicia, there were hardly any points of contact between the Moscow patriarchate and the Catholic Church during the period under

review. During his stay in Paris, Archbishop Photius met three times His Excellency Mgr. Beaussart, the Catholic hierarch entrusted with the spiritual care of foreigners in Paris. He also struck a more conciliatory note towards the Catholic Church than is usual with representatives of the Moscow hierarchy in a sermon preached in Paris (Cf. *The Tablet*, 25th October 1946).

Meanwhile, attacks on the Catholic Church continued in the *J.M.P.* A few random quotations will suffice to demonstrate the direction and the intellectual level of this unilateral polemic. In January 1946, Mgr. Luke, the Stalin prizewinner (see above), criticized the Pope's appeal for mercy for the German war criminals. The Archbishop quoted at length from the Old Testament and reminded "the defenders of Fascism" of Isaiah's words: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness" (v, 20). A historical article on the Orthodox Archbishop George Konissky describing the persecution of Orthodox peasantry by Catholic Poles and the efforts of this eighteenth century prelate to save the religious and civic liberties of the people ends with the following passage: "Armed Fascism has been overthrown, but its poisonous microbes are still alive. The enemies of world democracy are still trying to infect the healthy body of democracy by these microbes. It is generally known that the Vatican is one of the centres of attraction for all anti-democratic forces. There is no doubt that its agents are trying to poison the Uniate and the Orthodox flocks in Western Belorussia, Western Ukraine and Transcarpathian Ukraine." The author says that it is "the sacred duty" of all Orthodox clergy in the Ukraine and Belorussia "to teach the laity to thwart the intrigues of the enemies of the people and of the true Church of Christ" (February 1946). In the September issue Archbishop Hermogene supplies a historical survey of "the Vatican's attempts to subdue the Slav Orthodox Churches in the Balkans." The article ends: "The war has demonstrated who is the true friend, and who is the mortal enemy of the Slavs. Russia, which won a glorious victory over German Fascism, acted during this war as an all-Slav power and as a defender of the interests of the Slav world, while the papacy was favouring the bestial Fascism and defended the interests of Fascist Germany against the Slavs."

The grave subject of the destruction of the Uniate Church in what was formerly Eastern Poland and the Subcarpathian

Province of Czechoslovakia is so important that it deserves to form a subject for a separate article. Relevant documents up to July 1945 may be found in the *Sword of the Spirit* pamphlet *Eastern Catholics under Soviet Rule* by Michael Derrick, while the English text of the Encyclical Letter *Orientales Omnes* of His Holiness Pope Pius XII was published in the April-June 1946 issue of the *E.C.Q.* We limit ourselves here to a bare chronological table of main facts after July 1945 as published in the *J.M.P.*

December 1945 : The three Uniate priests, Frs. Gabriel Kostelnik, Michael Melnik and Anthony Pelvetsky, who formed the "Group Sponsoring the Reunion of the Greek-Catholic Church with the Orthodox Church" in May 1945, visited the metropolitan of Kiev who subsequently published a pastoral letter to the Uniate clergy and laity, urging them to return to Orthodoxy.

February 1946 : A larger group of Uniate priests arrived in Kiev where they were received into the Orthodox Church, while two of the members of the "Sponsoring Group" were consecrated bishops, Fr. Pelvetsky being appointed bishop of Stanisławów and Kolomyja and Fr. Melnik, bishop of Sambor and Drohobycz.

March 1946 : Council of the Greek-Catholic clergy in Lwów attended by the two newly consecrated Orthodox bishops and 204 Uniate priests. The Council, presided by Fr. Kostelnik decided "to liquidate the Union of 1596, to secede from Rome, to return to the ancestral Orthodox faith and to bring about a reunion with the Russian Orthodox Church." Messages were sent to Patriarch Alexius, the œcumenical patriarch at Constantinople, Generalissimo Stalin and the Ukrainian Premier, Khrushchev, and an appeal issued to the Uniate clergy and laity.

April 1946 : A delegation of this Council visited Moscow.

It may be noted in conclusion that most Moscow documents referring to these events mention the existence of opposition to these moves among the Uniate laity and clergy. Thus, the message sent by the Lwów Council to Patriarch Alexius says : "Even such an artificial product as the Union has deep roots in the hearts of some of our people (particularly monks and nuns)" (*J.M.P.*, 1946, 4, p. 25). The whole tenor of the appeal to the Uniate clergy and laity issued by the same Council (*ibid.*, pp. 29-31) proves the existence of a strong opposition. An interview given by Fr. Kostelnik to TASS

also mentions the existence of many opponents of the reunion among the clergy (*ibid.*, p. 36).

VICTOR FRANK.

EGYPT.

Some account of the actual organization of the Tribunals for Personal Status of the Christian and Jewish Communities in Egypt.

There are in Egypt some two and a half million members of fourteen minority (religious) groups, viz :

- (i) Orthodox, of Coptic, Greek, Syriac and Armenian rites ;
- (ii) Catholic, of Coptic, Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Maronite, Latin and Chaldean rites ;
- (iii) Protestants of all rites ;
- (iv) Jews, Rabbinical and Caraite.

The judicial system concerning the personal status of minorities in Egypt is based on religious allegiance. Thus the Mohammedans themselves in certain matters come under the jurisdiction of religious courts called the *charei* tribunals ; and according to a traditional system canonized by the Coran (in the *hadis* or word of the Prophet) Christians and Jews—as “ religions of the book ”—are entitled in such matters to be judged by courts of “ personal status ” according to their own norms ; and this system has obtained in Egypt from the time of the Kaliphate to our own days.

The modern development of the legislature and judiciary, however, tends to develop Egypt as an entirely Islamic country, and so recent Egyptian governments have tended to restrict little by little the competence of the *meqlis millis* or Community Councils for personal status, by regarding the *mehkemeh charei* or Moslem religious court as the court of common law for all the citizens of the national territory. To appreciate the unfairness of this movement we have only to imagine what would be the sentiments of the Mohammedans if the Patriarchal Courts were to sit in judgment on matters hitherto subject to the jurisdiction of the *chareis*.

Thus for several years the declaration of the guardianship of minors, lunatics and those absent from their estates, together with powers of administration and injunction, and the audit of trust funds, has had to pass through the special courts which apply the Mohammedan law, whatever may be the religious status of the persons concerned. Furthermore, two laws recently enacted have directed the Mohammedan law to be

applied to inheritance and testamentary dispositions, whatever be the status of the testator or deceased. Meanwhile, though the *meglis millis* is still theoretically entitled to issue certificates of inheritance which used to be of juridical value in common law, the difficulties which arise, sometimes from Governmental employees, sometimes from various Mohammedan institutions, compel many Catholics, *malgré soi*, to prefer to apply to the *mehkemeh chareï*, to obtain such documents without trouble or delay. Thus the value of the *meglis millis* is seriously being undermined.

Again, the judicial decisions used to be immediately executive, liable only to revision by higher courts in matters of form and procedure only, but now they are subject to rehearing *du fond*, nor may they be put into effect until after formalities which entail much loss of time and are withheld at the least opposition. On the other hand the judgments of the Mohammedan tribunals are put into force at once under the aegis of the civil power and without any revision or ratification.

The Government has now introduced a Bill ostensibly to remove these anomalies, the effect of which however would be completely to undermine the whole edifice of the religious and minoritarian courts, and undo in the space of a few years the elaborate work of generations. The proposed law, in brief, is to this effect :

(1) The Communities shall within six months inform the Ministry of Justice of their canon law and the doctrines on which they are based, to be approved by the Ministry in so far as they are found not to be contrary to the common welfare. This concept of "public order" or common welfare is vague in the extreme, and liable to vary not only according to country and religion, but even according to local legislative systems, legal writers, and subject matters.

(2) The Christian communities whose supreme authority resides beyond the boundaries of the country (Egypt), must abandon the right to appeal to it for final decisions; this affects not only the Maronites, whose patriarch resides in the Lebanon, but also the Syro-Chaldeans, Syrian Catholics and Armenian Catholics whose patriarchs live elsewhere, and even Melkites and Coptic Catholics, since all Catholics ultimately recognize Rome as the ultimate court of appeal. Among the Orthodox, this provision also affects the Armenians and Jacobites (Syriac Monophysite Church).

(3) Marriage for non-Mohammedans will become essentially a civil contract only, to be registered before an official appointed for this purpose, who will *ordinarily* be a non-Mohammedan, and the religious ceremony will not be regarded as an integral part of the procedure ; in fact they can contract marriage—though not Mohammedans—before the *charei* tribunal. This is a complete reversal of the traditional law, still in force ; already however some Christians are finding it is made more convenient for them to go before the *mehkemeh charei* to obtain the necessary civil documents easily and speedily. The latter marriages will later be judged by Mohammedan law and not by the law of the minority the spouses belong to.

(4) The Bill proposes to reserve to the wife the power of later repudiating her husband if she demands this provision before the registrar at the time of the civil marriage ; this is of course destructive of the whole *ethos* of Christian and Jewish marriage, which is essentially a lifelong contract. At present, the law provides, in case of matrimonial disputes, for recourse to (i) a religious court composed of priests (or rabbis) to determine the conditions of legal separation or annulment of marriage and (ii) the *meglis millis*, for the civil consequences of the decision of the religious court : provision for the children, inheritance, dowry, alimony, etc. This arrangement has worked to the satisfaction of all parties hitherto.

(5) The minimum age of marriage is established at sixteen years for the bride and eighteen years for the bridegroom ; and the approval of the marriage of an orphan girl must receive the approval of the *meglis hasbi*, not of the relatives or the Patriarchal court.

(6) New courts are to be established whose jurisdiction shall be restricted to matters strictly concerned with marriage and its immediate consequences ; all other matters being subject to the national common law courts.

(7) These new tribunals shall only be able to sit in judgment over members of minorities whose Egyptian citizenship is fully established. Thus for instance many Maronite families which may have been established in Egypt for several generations will be subject, willy nilly, to the national courts, despite the fact, that in other Arab states they have the privilege of minority rights and tribunals. This also applies to very many Jews, Armenians and Syrians of all rites. This is in opposition to the 25th article paragraph 4, of the Montreux Agreement, and to the whole principle of minority rights and the

laws of personal status according to religious allegiance in Mohammedan lands.

(8) The Bill also provides that the national tribunals or *chareis* may deal with disputes between members of minority communities on the application of one of the parties, despite the fact that the subject may be a contract, e.g., marriage, entered into under the minority community's law.

(9) The *chareis* (Mohammedan religious tribunals) become competent, and solely competent, in every case, if one of the litigants declares adherence to the religion of Islam, even if this conversion takes place after the commencement of the hearing, or even on appeal, and even after judgment has been given by the competent community tribunal. Clearly this opens the way to flagrant injustice, where a party having been found in the wrong may secure judgment in his favour according to Mohammedan law by fictitious conversion. This opens the door to the abandonment of family obligations, legitimized by the new proposals, despite the enactments of the national penal laws designed to strengthen the family ties. Thus a Christian spouse might involuntarily become subject to Mohammedan law despite the provisions of the Hague Convention (1905), the Montreux Agreements (1936), and even Egyptian law on international matters. Among the inequitable consequences of this provision we may mention that a Christian wife might be made subject to the regime of the *harem* if her husband embraces Islam, and on the other hand a Christian father may see himself divorced from his own home and his children against his will, brought up as Mohammedans if his wife chooses to profess the Coran.

(10) Jurisdiction in "mixed" cases is arrogated solely to the common law tribunals, not only where one of the parties is Mohammedan but even where both are Christian though of different rites or religious allegiances, and this independently of any mutual arrangements the various denominations or rites can make by common consent to cover these cases.

(11) What remains of the juridical powers in the proposed new Courts of Personal Status is further undermined by subjecting their decisions to the necessity of obtaining the countersignature of the President of the National Tribunal before their execution will be effected by the civil power; thus one juridical system is made to depend on and be subject to another.

(12) Hitherto a litigant in the *meglis millis* has been able to appeal to another (higher) court of the same legal system, corresponding to his minority group; the new proposals permit and even require any appeals to be made to the National Tribunals, composed—naturally—in greater part of Mohammedans. It is clear that this will inevitably tend to rob the *meglis millis* of all real jurisdiction.

(13) The judges of the new community courts are to be chosen from among qualified lawyers of the communities concerned, provided they are of established Egyptian citizenship; a condition which renders it impossible owing to the rigorous exclusiveness of the Egyptian citizenship and nationalization laws, for any Christian or Jewish community—even the Copts—to provide an adequate number of qualified judges.

(14) Advocates and attorneys for the new courts are to be nominated by the Ministry of Justice; they must be Egyptian nationals but they may be Mohammedans and not members of the community to whose court they have been appointed; furthermore they will be responsible for the performance of their legal obligations in the *meglis millis* to the Ministry of Justice.

(15) The cases which come under the jurisdiction of the *meglis millis*, being sacred, both by reason of their sacramental character and by reason of their relation to intimate details of family life, have hitherto always been held in the patriarchates of the Christian rites and the rabbinates of the Jews; by the new regulations, the *locale* of the hearings will be determined by the Ministry of Justice and *outside* the patriarchates to the prejudice of family and religious dignity and of the reconciliatory functions which has always been the first aim of the religious tribunals.

(16) The new tribunals are required to mulct litigants of expenses according to the tariff in force in the *charei* tribunals; this shows to what extent the formerly independent community courts are to be made subservient to the national juridical system.

(17) The Bill makes the National Court of Cassation (Supreme Court of Appeal) the arbitral court to determine conflicts of jurisdiction between the various courts of personal status: Milli, Charei, Hasbi and Mixed. This court, almost without exception composed of Mohammedans, ignores

entirely the religious doctrines and obligations, on the recognition of which the whole conception of personal status is founded. By this very fact the Christian and Jewish courts with their clients are put at the mercy of the Mohammedan magistracy and the yoke of the *charei* Law.

It will be seen how the Proposed Law is calculated to impose upon Christian and Jew alike the Mohammedan conception of marriage and the family, at the same time as the whole juridical position of their religious courts is prejudiced. In spite of these defects, the Bill will undoubtedly find an easy passage through a predominantly Mohammedan Chamber and Senate if pressed by the Government. It is to be hoped that the Government will not act prejudicially to the interest of so many thousands of Egyptian subjects.

The whole situation is the unhappily inevitable result of the fundamental error of making religious preconceptions the basis of a national judicial system in the absence of satisfactory guarantees and concessions for religious minorities, and this state of affairs is bound to lead to the domination of the minorities by the majority and consequently a fatal division of sentiment within the country. That being so, the widely published proposal to do away with all discrimination between Egyptian and Egyptian begins to take on an appearance of propaganda based not on enlightened juridical and legislative proposals but on re-actionary provincialism at best—for we hesitate to attribute religious bigotry to a friendly Government.

What then do the Religious Minorities request of an enlightened Egyptian Government?

First : they desire to retain their *meglis millis*, whose administrative control, as always, remains in the hands of the Government like any other juridical tribunals ;

Secondly : they beg that the Proposals be purged of principles in contradiction to their deepest religious convictions ;

Thirdly : they hope to see established a special Supreme Court composed of representatives of the various religious minority courts which shall be competent to solve problems arising from the conflicting jurisdictions of various *millis*.

Thus, without entrenching on the prerogatives of the Mohammedan majority of the fellow citizens, the Christian minorities may live in harmony with their country.

FINLAND.

ORTHODOXY MIGRATES WESTWARD.

Contrary to certain rumours abroad that alleged the monks of Valamo had returned to their original monastic isles on Lake Ladoga (now in Soviet territory), and that they had been put to rigorous ecclesiastical penance by the Moscow patriarchate for their past dealings with the Finnish State and new kalendar, etc., the monks have remained in Finnish territory, 110 Swedish miles south of Kuopio, the town where Archbishop Herman's see is evacuated from Sortavala. Monks from other monasteries, Konevitsa and Petsamo, are amalgamated with them to constitute the "Uusi (=new) Valamo" community. Until about a year ago, the site of Valamo isles had remained desolate and deserted behind the new frontier. Later news reports that the Soviet Government has instituted a tuberculosis sanatorium there. It is certainly true that discussions have taken place about a restoration of monastic life on Valamo islands; and the 'Igymoon Hariton and chapter are open to further negotiations, if satisfactory guarantees could be forthcoming to regularize their status there. It is further reported that the Soviet authorities have no objection in principle to their return to Ladoga. Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad has already requested Uusi Valamo to send two or three young, keen and intellectual monks who could become bishops in the Russian church. Bishop Alexander, quondam of Viborg, is now bishop of Helsingfors. The Old Style Russian parish of Viborg is now evacuated to Helsingfors. The corresponding Finnish Orthodox parish is also evacuated to Finland. Other Karelian parishes, Terijoki, Salmi, etc., and the nuns' convent from Lintula, are also evacuated and maintaining their continuity in Finnish territory. Helsingfors Old Style parish—a thriving and beautiful rural-looking little church, reconstructed shortly before the war in the forests, near a Jewish cemetery on the edge of the city—now acknowledges the Moscow patriarch: and continues as devoutly to liturgize its Doxology, certainly in a more Slavonic and conservative timbre, but certainly not with any other worldly motives or dubious activities. On the other hand, the presence of devout Finnish évacué Karelian congregations in the capital at the Finnish, Kolminaisuus = Trinity parish, constitute a *Finnish* Orthodox folk revival and survival that is a particularly moving example in the midst of the Protestant and secularized West. Confessions and Communion are noticeably more frequent and godly.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church continues to present the social implications of the Gospel; and in spring this year consecrated its Seamen's church at Antwerp, where it has flourishing clubs and a mission to our mercantile marine. At the recent cosmopolitan dress rehearsal for the Olympic Games of 1952, 50,000 athletes paraded for Divine Service in Helsingfors public squares on the opening Sunday, 29th June of the Sports Festival, and Bishop Gulin preached to them the Christian interpretations of *mens sana in corpore sano*.

It is common knowledge that the Finnish radio is now under the management of a notorious Estonian Communist. Yet not only are Orthodox and Lutheran services regularly broadcast, but recently leading Lutheran clergy answered a sort of "brains' trust" on the radio, giving salutary, traditional guidance for auricular confession; the consensus of their counsel being emphatic that regularized confession to a pastor is essential: and dealing with present-day lapses about Marriage and Alcohol.

ENGLAND.

On 3rd November 1946, the archbishop of Canterbury preached a sermon before the University of Cambridge in which he made a *suggestion* towards "full communion" of the Church of England with the Free Churches. We will quote two relevant passages: speaking of the Church of England and the Free Churches the Primate says "on the theology of Redemption and Grace, on the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, even on the Church itself there are no barriers that reach up to heaven. It is round the theology of the ministry that the tensions most exist: some would regard the ministry of the Church as derived from and subject to the will of the Church, the spirit-bearing Body, while others regard it as the original gift of Christ to His Church to be preserved in unbroken succession: and the synthesis of these not necessarily contradictory views has not yet been found."

We then come to the archbishop's suggestions. Having rejected what he calls the "constitutional" scheme, he says, "there is a suggestion which I should like in all humility to make to my brethren of other denominations. We do not desire a federation, that does not restore the circulation [this has reference to the first part of the sermon where it is said that in each fold the followers of our Lord draw their life from Him, but that this life does not freely circulate in separated folds]. As I have suggested the road is not yet open, we are not

yet ready, for organic or constitutional union. But there can be a process of assimilation, of growing alike. What we need is that while the folds remain distinct, there should be movement towards a free and unfettered exchange of life in worship and sacrament between them as there is already of prayer and thought and Christian fellowship—in short that they should grow towards that full communion in one another, which already in their separation they have with Christ.

The Church of England is in full communion with the Old Catholics on the Continent ; and its relations with the Orthodox Churches on the one hand and with the Church of Sweden and of Finland on the other already approach, if they do not yet reach, full communion. My longing is, not yet that we should be *united* with other churches in this country, but that we should grow to *full communion* with them.” Then coming to the question of episcopacy he says : “ The non-episcopal churches have accepted the principle that episcopacy must exist along with the other elements in a reunited Church. If they do so for a reunited Church, why not also and earlier for the process of assimilation, as a step towards full communion ? It may be said that in a reunited Church they could guard themselves in the constitution against abuses of episcopacy. But they could do so far more effectively by taking it into their own system.”

In conclusion he says : “ In putting forward this suggestion, I am presupposing that between the churches which concerned themselves with it there would be found to be agreement upon the essential principles of the Church, the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments and of the ministry itself as ‘a gift of God through Christ to His Church, essential to its being and well-being, perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit.’ [Lausanne Report 5] : and I believe that presupposition to be reasonable.”

Of course this sermon has had its critics. It has also been suggested that the Free Churches are not prepared for any concession, that they look to the Church of England to make the concessions, rather after the manner in which the Free Churches in this country have not stood out for denominational schools content that their own religion was taught in the State schools. This is very unlike the attitude of the Protestants in Holland or the position gained for Religious Schools in Scotland.

The Pilot (Jan. 1947) has an interesting comment. “ The most noteworthy point about the recent Cambridge sermon of

the archbishop of Canterbury is its recognition that attempts at reunion on the South India basis will not do. . . .” “He [the archbishop] sees that attempts at a corporate reunion with Nonconformists on a doctrinal basis reduced to a minimum cannot solve any problem. Rather he insists on the necessity, for intercommunion, of a levelling up of Nonconformity. He invites Nonconformists to admit episcopacy into their system. We have in fact a return to ‘the Lambeth Quadrilateral’ as a basis for reunion.”

But the most trenchant criticism, though constructive and helpful, comes from the Congregational minister, Daniel Jenkins, in *Theology* (August 1947). “It must be said at the outset,” says Mr. Jenkins, “that what the archbishop suggests has one outstanding merit. It represents a break with the notion that either we must aim immediately at complete organic union or else at nothing at all.” He then goes on to consider some unexamined assumptions. “It is frequently assumed that a decisive majority in all the churches involved in the discussions honestly believe division to be a sin, are intensely dissatisfied with their present state, and ardently long for reunion. Yet it is clear that the truth is very different.” Again: “the archbishop explicitly makes another assumption. He states that on the theology of Redemption and Grace, on the Scriptures, the Creeds, and the Sacraments, no fundamental divisions exist between the churches and that it is only around the doctrine of the ministry that difficulties gather. But surely the matter is not as simple as that. . . . It is sometimes argued that although this may be the case, theological divisions are no longer co-terminous with ecclesiastical divisions. That is true, but it is hard to see why this should be held to prove the further point that therefore the work of reunion is made easier. A church which is at unity within herself is in a position to formulate a policy towards other churches. A church radically divided cannot have such a policy for any attempt to frame one serves only to bring out the divisions, and even when her leaders attempt to give a lead they can rarely have confidence that it will be followed.”

He has much more to say, but we must content ourselves with only one more quotation, this time on the constructive side. “Serious conversations according to a definite plan about the chief theological issues which are outstanding between the churches must be reopened. . . . What is needed is not the light skirmishing over these matters which is in-

dulged in at short occasional conferences or at joint fraternal meetings, but their systematic study by groups of theologians who work together over them for a long period and who, if they reach a new agreement, do their utmost to compel their churches to make decisions on the basis of such agreement. . . . When in recent times, has a representative group of theologians really got to grips with the question of baptism? Yet it is hard to see how the great Baptist denomination is ever likely to join in a scheme unless it receives satisfaction in this matter. . . . When the effort is made, with the determination not to break off conversation when it becomes difficult, we believe that the outlines of new and fundamental agreement on many matters and not least those of baptism, and the ministry, will emerge."

It is against the background of this sermon and all that it stands for, that one should read the tome edited by the bishop of Oxford, *The Apostolic Ministry*. This was originally published July 1946 but has been reprinted in the February of this year. We will review it in our next issue. There is a slighter study entitled *Catholicity* that should also be read against the background of the archbishop's sermon. In fact it is a most relevant document since it is a report of fourteen Anglican theologians made at the request of the archbishop himself.

The preface tells us that it was in "November 1945 that Dom Gregory Dix was invited to convene a group of Anglicans of the 'Catholic' school of thought to examine the causes of the deadlock which occurs in discussion between Catholics and Protestants and to consider whether any synthesis between Catholicism and Protestantism is possible."

Canon Ramsey was elected chairman. Three sessions of the group were held in 1946, two of which lasted for three consecutive days. The final session was held in 1947. The group consisted of outstanding theologians and the result is a valuable report that deserves careful study. [See book reviews below.]

Here at any rate in these two volumes is no mere light skirmishing but the beginning of systematic study by a group of theologians at any rate from the Anglican side. May such work develop.

We would end this comment by expressing a thought that comes to us after reading Father Bévenot's review of *The Apostolic Ministry* in *The Month* (July-August 1947). Father Bévenot says in introducing his subject: "The importance

of the subject cannot escape us, and we should be foolish indeed, if, on the pretext that since there was no true priesthood or episcopate in the Church of England, we imagined that, like Gallio, we need 'care for none of these things.' Even if such writings were of no intrinsic value, their influence could not reasonably be neglected, and apart from the fact that the minds of many of our fellow countrymen might be affected favourably or otherwise to the Catholic Church, they can be of importance to the religious outlook of the country as a whole." When he comes to deal with Dr. Farrer's contributions on "The Ministry in the New Testament" he has to take the doctor to task "for his treatment of St. Peter and of Rome in a manner which is completely at variance with the rest of his work. Granted that in a polemical work many important questions have to be left aside, one would at least expect that where they do appear incidentally, they will be couched on with a certain moderation or at least in a way consonant with the general trend of thought followed in the rest of the essay." Here one cannot help reflecting how different things might be if in connexion with such a group of theologians and also with a similar group on the Free Church side there could be some liaison with Catholic theologians. This particular concern is of course directly the domestic affair of the Church of England and the Free Churches but indirectly insofar as it affects the religious outlook of this country, and who knows what the repercussions may be, it concerns us. The fact that small and regular meetings of theologians including Catholics do not come together at convenient centres, up and down the country is by no means to be put down only to the shyness and prejudice of the other side. There is no danger in such small groups genuinely interested in Christian Unity of the Catholic position not being understood. The idea of compromise has long since been given up in œcumenical circles. It may be said that those interested can consult the best Catholic books; yes, they can! But the friendly and constant meeting with theologians is far better, it is contact with a living tradition.

U.S.A.

Cardinal Tisserant visited the Catholics of the different oriental rites in the U.S.A. and Canada (20th April-25th June). The visit was not at all official but a friendly visit of the Cardinal Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church to the Eastern Catholics. He went to certain

of the important town centres and the Catholics came to see him, he was one week in Canada. He was accompanied everywhere by Mgr. Thomas McMahon, secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association.

The various Eastern Catholic groups are as follows:—

The Ukrainians and Podcarpathian Ruthenians, these are the largest and each have two bishops of their own rite. Melkites, Italo-Greeks, Rumanians and Russians all these belong to the Byzantine rite but come under the Latin bishop of the diocese though they have some leading priest of their own rite. There are some Ruthenians and Melkites in Canada, the first having their own bishop.

Of the non-Byzantine rites there are Armenians, Chaldeans, Maronites and Syrians (Pure rite), they come under the local Latin bishop but have their own head priest.

The work being done at St. Procopius Abbey at Lisle has grown under their new Abbot Ambrose Ondrak. These Latin monks of St. Benedict help to educate priests for the Carpathian-Ruthenian diocese of Pittsburgh. But as well as these Latin monks there is a small and growing community of Slavonic Byzantine monks who have their own chapel and their own liturgical Office, and hope some day to have their own independent monastery.

The cardinal was insistent on the purity of the Eastern rites and constantly quoted in statement, Pope Benedict XIV. "If any harm has been done to these rites, it is not to the Holy See that it can be ascribed." He said that he has two aims as head of the Sacred Congregation. To give correct liturgical books to each group, so that the Liturgy will be completely in the tradition of the centuries, and to train capable and zealous priests who will be conscious of the momentous mission of their rites. (From *Information*, May, June and July, 1947 and *S.I.C.O.*, June and July.)

TRANSJORDAN.

It has been reported in the *Egyptian Mail* that the Melkite Archbishop Boulos Salman of Transjordan stated before the U.N.O. Palestine Commission that perfect cooperation was maintained between his people and the Moslems under the wise rule and guidance of King Abdullah and according to the Constitution.

The following is a précis of a description of the Catholic problem in Transjordan by a member of the "Institut des

The Liturgy at St. Anne's, Jerusalem



By courtesy of Major Ramsay Fairfax



Auxiliaires des Missions " who had been sent there by Mgr. Hughes.

[The illustrations show the celebration of the Byzantine liturgy at St. Anne's, Jerusalem. This seminary is under the direction of the White Fathers and the majority of the Melkite (Greek Catholic) secular clergy who labour in Transjordan and throughout the Patriarchate are prepared there. The fact that there is no eikonostasis seems to be due to a French Minister of Fine Arts. We hope things will change !]—THE EDITOR.

Transjordan, the smallest Arab state, holds a favoured position in the Near East between Syria, Iraq, the Hedjaz, Egypt and Palestine. It is the best example in existence of a primitive Arab society. Bordering on the Arabian peninsula, the mysterious cradle of Islam, it has remained free from foreign influence up to the present day. Although it is culturally backward and having few contacts with the outside world, knows little of either progress or decadence, it has its own tribal civilization, based on the ancient Arabic and Islamic traditions. The 400,000 inhabitants of this territory of 57,000 square miles, comprising the chain of mountains between the Jordan and the Dead Sea on the one hand and the Syrian desert on the other, are a nomadic race, now nearly all settled, although most of them move with their herds to a fresh pasturage for part of the year. Shepherds and small-scale farmers, these Arabs care nothing for architecture or town-planning, and the new stone houses are not very different from the tents they are beginning to supersede.

For the Arab lives in close contact with the earth, and being born a poet, it is in natural beauty rather than in mysticism or asceticism that his peculiar temperament can at all times find God. Loving things for their own sake, he has none of the discontent which compels either creation or money-making. He is an artist who never produces anything, a lover of his country who could never feel the proprietary passion of the patriot.

But life in Transjordan is changing. On 26th May 1946, the emirate became an independent kingdom under British protection. The emir Abdullah is now king of Transjordan, and rumour has it, potentially king of a future kingdom of Greater Syria. English protection is tactful and popular, and provides a useful example of organization at this stage of transition. For the life of the desert is rapidly giving way to the life of the city, and there is great danger in the dizzying

swiftness of change. Camels disappear, to be replaced by American luxury cars. Arab dress gives way to European. The lust for gold, of which these people were before quite innocent, has been aroused by these contacts with western capitalistic civilization. Whole families and even tribes are flocking into the towns, where each sets up its quarters. Even in the city, family life remains the basis of social organization, and assumes a sinister significance with the re-emergence, in cramped circumstances, of the blood feud and the rough justice of tribal law.

For in the Arab caste, it is not the individual who counts, but the family. All personal activity, even religious, is dictated by the will of the clan. Living conditions do not favour the full development of personality. Privacy is impossible in the Arab household. The knowledge of security and lack of personal responsibility discourage initiative or departure from established custom. Everyday tribal life is too easy and natural to force out individuality. It is not surprising that hardly any *making* is ever done in the desert. The only movement is unhurried—the slow migration of flocks to a new pasturage, or the leisurely trafficking of merchandise between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. Since the Arab is without ambition and reduces his needs to a minimum, he prefers to spend his days in talk and meditation. There seem to be more shops than clients, for trade is here an aesthetic rather than a utilitarian activity. The idleness of peace-time military life makes the army a popular career among the young men. The real centre of life is the divan, where guests are received. Among a race of wanderers, the divan is the emblem in space of what is signified in time to Europeans by continuity of name. It stands, as in Europe the schools have stood, for the perpetuation of cultural tradition. The excessive ceremonious coffee-drinking symbolizes the ancient hospitality of the desert and the special sanctity of the guest.

But in his contact with modern urban civilization, the Bedouin is hampered by the very traditions to which he clings. In becoming a citizen, he contracts new obligations towards the state, but his tribal and patriarchal obligations remain. Usurers thrive on the consequent financial difficulties of individuals.

At this critical juncture the role of the Christian Church could be decisive. Transjordan, the biblical land of Basan, Galaad, Moab and Edom, also comprises part of the Holy Land. Our Lord very probably crossed the Jordan in the

course of his journeyings. We know from the *Acts of the Apostles* that Arabs from Transjordan were in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Flourishing Christian centres early existed: such were Madaba, Gerache, Philadelphia, Petra, Main, Hesebon, etc. These rich Byzantine cities were destroyed by the Persians under Chosroes in the seventh century, followed by the Arab invaders, and centuries of nomad life did the rest. Today only ruins, half-buried in sand, remain of the great monuments of the faith.

Yet Christianity did not die out, and there are today 40,000 Christians in Transjordan. But by the second half of the nineteenth century, the Greek church was in a state of decadence, with her tradition endangered by the ignorance of the native clergy. In 1860 a mission was launched from the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, but, in accordance with contemporary views, it aimed at setting up Latin parishes alongside the established Greek ones. The courage and saintliness of the missionaries bore fruit, and there are today a score of missions comprising 7,000 Latin Catholics, with flourishing parochial schools. But the more austere and abstract Roman rite remains alien to the Eastern mind, used to the sensuous and moving Byzantine liturgy. Moreover, a nationalist element creeps in—the Latin mission is sometimes called Italian, and tribal jealousies are excited.

Yet difficulties have only increased with the advent of a Greek Catholic mission begun in 1908, and after a period of strain in which it was eyed askance by the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, finally recognized by Rome in 1932, when a Byzantine eparchy was set up under a Greek archbishop of Philadelphia, Petra and all Transjordan.

Thus there is in this tiny country, nine-tenths of whose population are Musulmans, the unedifying spectacle of rival Catholic hierarchies, Latin and Melkite, side by side with the Orthodox hierarchy boasting apostolic succession, not to mention Anglicans and Protestants. Instead of being an eastern expression of Catholicity, the Church is made to appear alien and partisan. The Catholics seem to act like politicians rather than apostles, when for instance, they play on tribal jealousies to further their particular cause.

But this division is typical of the Western attitude. The sense of schism that still keeps us divided has meant on the Western side a lack of sympathy and of the will to understand. The attitude of Latin missionaries towards the Eastern churches is too often that of the seminary teacher who but recently

spoke to his pupils of "waiting their happy death." Transjordan is a test case for it contains in miniature the whole problem of relations between Eastern and Western Christianity, with the advantage of a clearer issue, as there are only two rival Catholic churches as opposed to seven in the neighbouring countries.

The final jurisdictional solution is a matter for inspired ecclesiastical authority, but it remains for individuals to direct the power generated by prayer and goodwill. They can best do this through personal contacts, and the determined efforts of the individual Christian, whether Eastern or Western, to build once again, through charity and mutual respect, a characteristically Eastern church. The West must not forget that our prayer and our faith are taught and disciplined by tradition, and it is to the early piety of the East, closely following patristic tradition, that we ought to turn as the source of grace. The important thing is the sacramental life of each parish, which must be built up humbly and patiently, in the hope that individual personalities will emerge who will form a spiritual *élite*, fitted to make their Christian faith a dynamic force in actual life. This interior renaissance will then find expression in a modern church organization, springing from Eastern tradition and crystallizing in ritual forms through which the faithful of the Near East will be able to express a natural and joyful worship of God.

At the moment, the Eastern rite clergy are numerically and spiritually inferior to the Latin clergy, partly because, though not hindered, they receive no active help from these. Yet in the Greek Catholic Church, which has remained jealously careful of the full Byzantine tradition, and is spiritually alive and creative in all the better of its members, there is already to be seen one of the primary sources and perhaps the most important, of the ecclesiological synthesis of the future. Her role, especially in Transjordan, is not to swallow up the Orthodox brethren one by one but rather to open up to some deeper religious life and to inspire in the whole Orthodox community, by her holy way of living and her respect for the past, the desire for co-operation within the framework of the Universal Church.

The Eastern Uniate churches must not be considered as bait to entice the Orthodox into the Roman fold. They are the makeshift bridges between two traditions which have continued parallel too long, and which ought to converge in mutual support and love. It is for them to show Eastern

Christians that one must be Catholic to be fully Orthodox, and to make known to the whole world the eternal values of Eastern Christianity.

But while the Church is divided it will not be easy to convince the Musulmans of its unique and universal mission. At a recent Musulman conference, it was obvious that the speakers, sincerely anxious for the peace and concord of mankind, regarded "the Latins" of Western Europe as no more than one among many warring sects. The monotheistic religion of Islam, universal but incomplete, has done much for this race of wanderers, bringing single families within the framework of the "oumma," the circle of believers. But it remains for Christianity to bring about a communion of individual persons in Christ. There are great potentialities in this proud and dignified people which have lain dormant for centuries under their pastoral nomadic existence. Schools will have a great part to play in the new development of personality that is necessary with the coming of a more advanced civilization, in detaching and isolating the individual within his family and tribal environment, drawing out individual differences between the children, and developing the peculiar gifts of each. But a revival of Christian monasticism is above all needed to arouse in this poor but proud and ancient people the flame of charity and respect for poverty, and a sense of their brotherhood with the whole human family. The first step is above all to fire the interest and enthusiasm of those gifted individuals who will in turn influence their environment. It is through friendship and through charity that such work must be done. Great effort and self-sacrifice is called for on the part of Greek and Latin clergy alike, in the interest of no lesser or partial cause but of a new Catholicism in Transjordan which will be the peculiar Eastern expression of the integral Christianity of the whole Church.

OBITUARY

HIS LATE BEATITUDE LEONDIOS, THE ORTHODOX ARCHBISHOP
OF CYPRUS.

On 20th June 1947, an election was held at Leukosia, the capital of Cyprus, to appoint an archbishop to the Throne of Cyprus which had been vacant since 16th November 1933. The electors comprised the three bishops of Cyprus, the hegoumenoi of the seven most important monasteries of the island, two of the higher ecclesiastics of the Archbishopric, and sixty-six general representatives of the Orthodox population of Cyprus (forty-four laymen and twenty-two parochial priests). The election took place at the Archiepiscopal Palace at Leukosia under the presidency of the representative of the œcumenical patriarch of Constantinople, the bishop of Derkon, who having addressed the assembly, then declared the proceedings open. Mr. Loizos Philippou of Paphos speaking for the representatives then expressed their gratitude to the œcumenical patriarch of Constantinople for his assistance in the question of the election of an archbishop. Voting then followed and the result was :—fifty-eight votes for the metropolitan of Paphos, Lord Leondios, seventeen votes for the archbishop of Sinai, Lord Porphyrios, and one vote for the Hegoumenos Gregorios of the Monastery of Machaeras. The metropolitan of Paphos thanked the electors, but stated that he felt unable to accept the office of archbishop of Cyprus, and it was only after considerable persuasion on the part of the assembly that he finally acceded to their wishes. The enthronement was performed the same day in the Cathedral of St. John the Theologos at Leukosia.

His Beatitude, Lord Leondios, archbishop of Nea Ious-tianoupolis and of all Cyprus, was a most popular figure in the Island and was beloved of the people. He had devoted his whole life to the welfare of the Church and of the Island of Cyprus. He was born at Lemesos (Limassol) in 1896 and completed his studies at the Gymnasium of Lemesos in 1913. In 1919 he was ordained deacon and given a scholarship by the see of Kition to the University of Athens from which he graduated with honours in the Theological Faculty in 1923. In 1928 he was sent to America as a scholar of the University of Athens on account of his eminent learning. He studied at the General Theological Seminary of New York and pursued a course of studies in philosophy at the University



HIS LATE BEATITUDE, LORD LEONDIOS,
Archbishop and Ethnarch of Cyprus

of Columbia, New York, obtaining the degrees of bachelor of Theology and master in Sacred Theology. On 6th August 1930, he was consecrated and enthroned metropolitan of Paphos, Cyprus, after having been unanimously elected by the representatives of the people and the Church. On the death of Cyril III, archbishop of Cyprus, on 16th November 1933, he became Locum Tenens of the Archiepiscopal Throne of Cyprus, and on the death of Nicodemos, metropolitan of Kition, in 1937, also became Locum Tenens of this see.

About two weeks after his election, he fell sick, and in spite of the best medical attention available, his illness became acute and on Thursday, 24th July intercessions for his restoration to health were ordered to be held in all churches throughout the Island. On the following day, the Last Sacraments were administered to him, and on Saturday, 26th July at 2.35 p.m. he went to his rest. The next day, Sunday, 27th July a day of general mourning was observed throughout the Island. He was buried at Leukosia after an impressive funeral service in the Cathedral of St. John the Theologos.

The passing away of their beloved prelate is an irreparable loss to the inhabitants of Cyprus. His Beatitude was a sincere priest and a true Christian who did his best to improve the lot of the poor and the oppressed. He spent his life in the service of his country and Church, and fearlessly strove to effect the union of Cyprus with her beloved mother country, Greece.

May the Lord God remember His Beatitude Leondios for ever in His Kingdom. Eternal Remembrance !

Pending the election of a new archbishop of Cyprus which cannot take place before the expiration of three months, the aged prelate, the metropolitan of Kyrenia, Lord Macarius, has assumed the duties of Locum Tenens of the Archiepiscopal Throne of Cyprus. His Lordship was born at Prodomos, Cyprus, in 1870, and obtained the degree of master of Sacred Theology in the University of Athens in 1903. In 1905 he was sent to study at the University of Oxford. In 1917 he was elected metropolitan of Kyrenia.

O.H.E. HADJI-BURMESTER,
Paphos, Cyprus, 1, VIII, 1947.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

We have to report the death on 21st July of His Beatitude Mar Joseph Thomas, Patriarch Katholikos of Babylon of the Chaldeans. He was 95 years old. R.I.P.

It seems to be agreed now that St. Benedict died in 547. Hence the year 1947 is the 1400th anniversary of his death, so the *E.C.Q.* with all Benedictine periodicals records this fact with thankfulness for the past blessings and hope for the future trusting in his intercession and protection in this "endeavour," as Pope Pius XI impressed on us, "by word and writing to create in the West a greater interest in and a more intense effort of study of the lines of cleavage between West and East."

It is in honour both of the Assumption of Mary, the All Holy Mother of God, and of St. Benedict and St. Basil that we publish these two eikons in the present issue.

The Changing World. Edited by Bernard Wall and Manya Harari. The Harvill Press. 3s. 6d.

A quarterly review devoted to philosophy, sociology, criticism and the arts and to documentation by experts on current questions. We welcome this review.

The Downside Review, July 1947. In an issue of the *E.C.Q.* last year (July–September, 1946) while reviewing the Anglican periodical *Theology* we remarked that Catholics in this country have not any real theological review, so it is with special pleasure that we read on the cover of *The Downside Review* "The Catholic Quarterly of Theological Metaphysics and Monastic History," and on turning inside to find the following statement: "There has been no Catholic quarterly in this country which could be described as theological in the fullest sense of the word. We are therefore making it our chief aim to provide a regular supply of articles and book-notices which shall show (as far as possible in non-technical language) the best work of contemporary Catholic thinkers on the subject of man's permanent and fundamental concern: the fuller understanding of human experience and of God's Revelation to us in Christ and His Church." We welcome this new line taken by our contemporary and in a future issue we will review its pages.



By courtesy of C. F. L. St. George

DORMITION OF OUR LADY
16th Century, Moscow School



By courtesy of the Monks of Amay-Chevetogne

ST. BENEDICT AND ST. BASIL
A Fifteenth Century Eikon

List of the writings of the Professors of the Russian Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris (1936-47).

The editor, Professor L. Zander, has given us a list of the works, some of them manuscript, of the fourteen Professors of the Theological Institute. It is a goodly array and speaks well for the intellectual life to be expected in the future Russian Orthodox clergy.

The Soviet Union by "Sarmazius," "The Sword of the Spirit," have done well to bring out this shilling booklet, it will certainly be useful. It is to be hoped that the editor of *The Sword* when dealing with the problem of Russia will study carefully the pages of *Russie et Chrétienté*.

Church Life in Europe and the Near East.

This is an interesting survey published by Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster. It mentions the Society of *Unitas* at Rome and gives some comment on Catholic activities, eleven pages out of twenty-eight are given up to the Churches of the Christian East.

A number of prayer books published by the Catholics of the Byzantine rite in the U.S.A. and Canada have been sent us.

Prayer Book for Ukrainian Greek-Catholic personnel of His Majesty's Canadian Forces. It has the imprimatur of Bishop Basil Ladyka, Winnipeg 1943. Its format is like our *Simple Prayer Book*. Thirty-two pages out of ninety-five are taken up with the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in Slavonic and English on alternate pages. There are similar acts, preparation for Confession, etc., as in our English book.

A Manual of Prayers and Services for the use of Romanian-American Catholics of the Byzantine Rite, 1946. (Cleveland, Ohio). This is a book of 693 pages and throughout is in Rumanian and English. This is distinctly Byzantine in feel, though a number of prayers and practices have been taken over from Latin prayerbooks, e.g., the Rosary, the Way of the Cross and twenty-six pages of meditation on the end of man. But very much in the book is excellent.

The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom with proper reference to that of St. Basil and of the Presanctified, a very full Calendar with Triodion, Pentecostal and Resurrection Tropars, the

Sacraments of Matrimony, and Holy Unction are given according to the ritual though the last is very much shortened. But confession is simply dealt with under very elaborate examinations of conscience, and Baptism is considered as in case of emergency; in neither treatments of these sacraments have the liturgical rites been given. In a new edition these sacraments could be given full liturgical significance and some of the meditations, etc. left out, this would be of real value to the book.

Unity of Sacrifice in the Eastern and Western Churches, by Father J. de Boer. 1947. (St. Josaphat's Seminary, Washington, D.C.) This is a comparative review of the Byzantine Liturgy and the Latin Mass. Father de Boer is the rector of the seminary, a Dutchman who transferred to the Byzantine rite after the first world war and has worked in Galicia, so he is fully qualified to bring out this very excellent and useful little book. There is an appendix giving a list of all the Ruthenian churches of both Exarchates, some 314 churches, in the U.S.A.

Supplementary issue of *E.C.Q.*
Tradition and Scripture.

Being the papers read at the Oxford Conference in 1946.
This can be obtained from Mr. Coldwell, 17 Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1. Price 2s.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

NON-CATHOLIC.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift. (1945-46).

It is undoubtedly due to the spiritual and intellectual isolation in which Switzerland found itself during the war that *I.K.Z.* devotes most of the available space of the last numbers to news from abroad. News which by the time it reaches England is rather dated.

A surprising amount of interest is shown in the Orthodox Churches. Unfortunately almost all information is derived not from original sources but from newspapers, periodicals of the most varied political and religious complexion. The result, as might have been expected, is sometimes rather startling. Unless both writer and reader are well acquainted

with the source from which the information is derived the picture thus obtained will be very distorted especially if in addition a passage is incorrectly translated.

In the July-December number 1945, it is reported that during a celebration of the Orthodox Liturgy in St. Alban's Cathedral, Holy Communion was given to all those present who desired it. The source for the statement was given as *The Church Times*, but in fact the report in the *Church Times* states explicitly that the celebrating priest invited the congregation to receive the *Antidorn*, explaining that it was merely *blessed* and *not consecrated* bread. In spite of the fact that the editor of *I.K.Z.* was asked to correct this error no such correction ever appeared nor was the letter even acknowledged.

In the field of religious journalism as elsewhere devotion is no substitute for accuracy, which in reporting œcumenical work is doubly necessary, for every false step is a step backwards.

M.S.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

UNIATISM¹

DEAR FATHER,

I. Cf. pp. 98-99 *E.C.Q.*, April-June 1947. It is certainly amends, in the cause of genuine Byzantine Catholicism, that a "Man in the Nave," presumably Catholic, could be shocked by Dr. Gulovich's aberrations into the self-evident remonstrance: "Any Orthodox wanting ammunition for the perennial contention that Rome in fact deforms and hybridizes Eastern tradition and practice with the ultimate object of complete westernization and absorption, has a hand-grenade ready made in that unfortunate footnote." To his salutary rallying on behalf of orderly Orthodoxy, one need only add:—(1) Full Orthodox services are not too long for children of three years—and to claim that vernacular articulation, reiterating its repetitions of oral instruction in the technique of the original Christoic κήρυγμα, combined with the full majesty of the imperial rite, does sustain the interest of young Orthodox since they first toddle into the numinous twilight of incense, eikons and candlelight. This is not to deny that subsequent lapses may take place in later years. But at least this loss is less than Uniates' drifting off from their rite because it lacks such hold over them in all its imperial integrity.

¹ The writer of this is an Orthodox.

(4) *The Eikonostasis*, is now absolutely indispensable. An obvious solution the present writer improvised in his Hima-layan ὄράτοριον, with a rood beam supporting Golgotha, lampada, main eikons at their appropriate stations; then curtains suggested by Syrian and Armenian rite, but embroidered with the Russian Cross and fixed with the miniature eikons (MP. ΘΥ. and ΙΗC, ΧΡC.). This makes a portable "tabernacle," like Israel used on trek, that can be erected in hotel dressing-rooms, etc. (when necessary). We are told that the illustrations of Ukrainian churches "show that the . . . best . . . tradition is still alive in the U.S.A." (p. 97). The upper specimen is spoilt by two side altars with ambries and eikonic reredoses: the lower one is only a *pucka* Latin altar behind rigid ranks of *pews*!

It is perhaps interesting that Islam in the West has been faced with a similar demand for modern seating, etc., and has consistently refused to give "Mammon" or Sybarites any sedentary accommodation in their *masjid*. The reasons given by Muslim divines are interesting and Orthodox, though not relevant for quotation here. In general Islam has plagiarized *more* from the Christian East than is generally recognized. Helsinki's Tartar mosque has three or four chairs but is otherwise spaciouly wide, open and carpeted.

II. Cf. p. 103 down. Celibacy is undoubtedly the real concrete, stumbling-block between Orthodox and Catholicism in practice. As D. Attwater has observed, Eastern Christendom will not change her ruling, nor the Latin West her discipline (in this connexion). An Orthodox may well claim that our ruling is the most reasonable and authentic œcumenical tradition. But—and here the Catholic may retaliate with an accusation of our backsliding—it must be faced that Monachism is dying out in the non-papal East, from the jungles of Malabar, to Athos, the Balkans and Lapland. Soon it may dwindle away to the last stragglers of extinct "anachronistic, eccentric" hermits. Consequently it is today saddling the wrong horse to man the Apostolate of the East with celibate religious, instead of the normal married priests and deacons needed there in droves. Yet it is openly boasted that in a generation the last "married Priests" in U.S.A. will be liquidated or superannuated for the Uniates!

III. The ideal solution would be a counter-uniate movement in Catholicism, an Orthodox revival in the West, aspiring to become more loyal to the venerable *Urform* than even the

contemporary professedly Orthodox. As Dom Clement Lialine, a Russian Latin (Benedictine of Chevetogne) has observed: even purged of hybridism the Catholic Byzantine rite lacks a *je ne sais quoi*, timbre or ethos, "something wanting in the rite to make it absolutely the same as the Orthodox Byzantine rite. . . . At the present time the *active realization* of the Byzantine element in the Roman Catholic Church can be considered insufficient. . . . Reunion needs the reassimilation by the Catholic Church of the living Byzantine tradition, a more perfect actualization of her Catholicity." And those who lose heart for ever reattaining the Byzantine heritage lost to Catholicism should see this revival in practice at Chevetogne, where Amay is re-established. The aberrations of uniate dabbblings are shunned, and Liturgies, concelebrations etc., avoid the old dilemma: "I wouldn't have a rite that lasts the whole blest Sunday, but one that gives me half a dozen Masses all on one day!" Early morning Liturgies at Chevetogne last winter, without being in any sense "Low"-church or-Mass, were as brief as daily Liturgies at Valamo Monastery. Perhaps it was something more than the liturgist's full Greek, primitive *felónion* that seemed in this *milieu* to carry one back to associations with the catacombs and the Mysterio-Religion at the very dawn of the Faith.

Helsinki, Finland.

VASSILY JAMES.

This letter has been slightly curtailed.—EDITOR.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204. By George Every, S.S.M. (S.P.C.K.). 12s. 6d.

Though not a work of original research, yet as a wide survey of the growth of the Byzantine patriarchate and as an account based on the latest discoveries in this field, Brother Every's book will command a sympathetic hearing from specialists in Byzantine history. It is well written and the picture it gives of most aspects of religious life of Eastern Christendom is alive. The first chapter sketches Byzantine civilization and does justice to the works of scholars who have dealt with the subject, including Dr. Norman H. Baynes, though the author might with advantage have quoted his booklet—*Byzantine Empire* (London, 1925)—which is to my mind the best of the many accounts of Byzantine civilization that have been published in recent years.

The two following chapters sum up the troubles raised by the Monophysites and the Nestorians, a subject dreaded by all Church historians, as it does not lend itself to vulgarization. The account is accurate, but lacks the philosophical background of the two controversies. The differences between conditions and mentality in Rome and Constantinople are well accounted for on pages 37-90 and the author shows well how the Western Church of the fourth century, being surrounded by a pagan society, felt intensely hostile to all forms of Arianism and made the Latins such staunch defenders of the unity of God. The writer is not so happy in dealing with the influence of neo-Platonism on these struggles and will find it difficult to make his views acceptable to philosophers and theologians.

The chapter on Justinian is more satisfactory than the preceding one on the rivalries between Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome, and one is glad to find on page 68 an appraisement of that emperor's character and services to the Church fairer than any found in most handbooks of Church history.

The author mentions on page 65 the Profession of Faith which the popes were expected to sign till the twelfth century before taking possession of the Lateran. It is regrettable that he ignores the edition of this profession by Th. E. von Sickel (*Liber Dirunus*, Vienna, 1889). This important document illustrates the trend of dogmatic evolution from the fourth to the eighth centuries, the role which Rome played in it and the mutual relations between the popes and the Byzantines. Again, the study of this profession as published by J. Friedrich in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy (1890) would have helped the author to make his account of this period more intelligible and interesting.

The author is aware of the importance of Islam in the evolution of the Eastern Church after the seventh century and in chapter the sixth has some stimulating things to say about the ideological affinity between Christianity and Mohammedanism. It is a great subject, too often evaded by Church historians and theologians. As Brother Every is dealing with the history of the Christians under Turkish rule, I hope he will return to the topic.

Chapters vi and vii, which deal with the worship of images and iconoclasm, are the best of the book. They are not exhaustive and some statements could be questioned (on the attitude of the iconoclasts to monasticism, p. 106, to the arts

p. 101, and to learning, p. 110)—but on the whole, this part of the book will appeal most to the general reader.

Chapters ix and x deal with the relations between Byzantium, Rome, the Franks and the Slavs and follow the recent discoveries made in this field. They form an excellent introduction to a more exhaustive study. A few inaccuracies in the history of Photius—with regard to the character of the emperor Michael III, p. 118, Photius' "invention" on the heresy of two souls, p. 119, his refusal to give communion to the usurper Basil I, p. 129—will I hope, be cleared up, together with other problems which Brother Every does not touch, when my book on the *History and Legend of the Photian Schism*, now in print, will be out. Still, I am surprised to see that the author still clings to the antiquated theory of the priority of the Glagolitic alphabet over the Cyrillic (p. 137). Most of the Slavonic philologists have abandoned it.

A final solution of the Photian problem will likewise shed more light on the relations between East and West in the tenth century, with which the author deals in chapter x. Meanwhile, it gives one satisfaction to find a more gracious judgment on some popes of this "dark age" of the papacy (p. 143), who suffered from the exaggerations of the reformers of the eleventh century. But I would not go so far as the author in accepting a breach between Rome and Constantinople at this period. I shall deal with the Roman Empire as renovated by the Ottos in another book—*The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*—which carries on the problem where Brother Every leaves it.

Chapters xii–xiv, which deal with the relations between East and West after 1054, contain interesting details based on the author's own researches. It is made evident in the light of them that large ecclesiastical bodies remained in communion with Rome till the beginning of the thirteenth century and the author deserves well of specialists for recording cases that are less accessible to them. There are others, however, that concerned westerners more directly; and I hope to study aspects of intercommunion between Russia of Kiev, Bohemia and Germany in the book I just mentioned. Other instances can be gathered from western medieval chronicles to show that the notion of an oriental schism starting in 1054, so far generally accepted, needs revision.

I have an impression that the author has somehow misunderstood certain theological problems. For instance, his reading of the significance of the *Filioque* is, to put it mildly, very

strange. How can he find there a "sign of the subordination of the Holy Ghost"? (p. 196). On the same page, he blunders badly in connexion with the western and eastern conception of the Eucharist. Yet, on the whole, his book serves as a good introduction to the study of the Byzantine Church and deserves to be read.

Of his statements that matter, I would quarrel with one and it concerns the relations between Church and State in Byzantium. He accepts the opinion recently advanced by some Byzantine scholars, that the emperor's place in the Church was that of a deacon in the liturgy. The comparison is erroneous. The emperor was regarded as much more than a deacon, and for the matter of that, more than even a bishop. He stood outside the hierarchy altogether, as the only representative of God on earth, the only legislator in all things, responsible before God for the true worship among Christians. No other consideration will ever solve the Church and State problem in Byzantium which so puzzles the author. This political philosophy, as I have shown in my Birkbeck Lectures (to be published under the title—*Political Philosophy of the Christian East*)—was a Hellenistic conception adopted both by Rome and Constantinople; and the fundamental reason for the final break between East and West will be found in the diverging evolution of this ideology in the Roman and Byzantine spheres of influence. The Hildebrandine reform and the evolution of the papacy can only be understood in the light of Hellenistic thought.

Not that I blame the author. Be it said to his credit, he is well aware of the problem and honestly tries to find a solution. He would have found it with better luck.

F. DVORNIK.

Windows Westward. Rome, Russia, Reunion. By Very Rev. Stephen C. Gulovich, Ph.D., S.T.D. The Declan x McMullen Co., New York. pp. 185. \$2.50.

The key phrase in this book is, "the Byzantine-Slavonic rite," and in the main, the reason of this study is to give the English-speaking public a full presentation of the background to the Byzantine-Slavonic Catholics in America.

As a matter of fact it is much more than what one may at first sight infer from the above statement, because Dr. Gulovich, when he uses the name Byzantine-Slavonic rite, means the whole historical, cultural, and religious background which the term denotes. And here the author is

to be congratulated in presenting the subject in the only way, though by no means the one always given by Catholics in the past, that lends itself to a true interpretation of what these Catholics really stand for. Dr. Gulovich is the Chancellor of the Rusin Exarchate in the United States and so speaks with authority. He has a vision of Catholic unity in which he conceives the Catholic Byzantine-Slavonic Church as the "hope of the East," to use the phrase of Pope Urban VIII, although at present the stronghold of the Ruthenians is in the U.S.A. and not in Central Europe. We are grateful for this vision, although we may not agree in every detail, because it throws into a new light the importance of the retaining and strengthening of the Byzantine and other Eastern rites in the U.S.A. It looks as if many of the important problems of the reunion of East and West will be worked out in the far West.

We will summarize the book :—

The first three chapters deal mainly with liturgical rites ; a description, the diversity and unity in the Catholic Church, and the historical study of the Byzantine rite. Chapters four and five consider the history and culture of the Slavonic peoples. The "Russia and the Future" is considered. Chapter nine is devoted to Vladimir Soloviev's *Memorandum* on the position of the Russian church which he submitted to Pope Leo XIII. Then a chapter on the Byzantine-Slavonic Catholics in America and this indirectly refers to many of the Orthodox groups in the States, since they were originated or strengthened by various schismatic Ruthenian clergy and laity. This fact should be borne in mind when considering the Catholic-Orthodox problem in the U.S.A. There is a concluding chapter. And each chapter is also given a bibliography which takes up twenty-nine pages. So we are presented with what the author calls a brief and helpful guide-book. We would say it is much more than that.

In comment we consider it an excellent introduction for anyone who wishes to follow up the study by the help of the suggested bibliography, while at the same time it gives some sort of guidance for those Catholics who briefly want to know something of their brethren of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite.

But it also is grappling with the problem of Rome, Russia and Reunion, the sub-title of the book. And here we think it suffers, perhaps unconsciously, from viewing the problem *too much* from the Ruthenian angle. For instance the Greeks

and Constantinople are not spared, we know that this is also to be found in Soloviev, we also know that the instances are mostly historical, but there is the feeling that this spirit is carried over into the present time which certainly does not help the cause of reunion. And in regard to the present day problem of the Russian Orthodox Church much could have been learnt from Miss Helen Iswolsky's two books (they are in the bibliography). But having said this we would emphasize the importance of the book both as a handbook and as honestly coming to grips with the great problem.

This book has brought to the fore two immediate needs. We would need a similar book on the Melkites, and Maronites, etc. And one would like to see other groups of Oriental Catholics with their own bishops, the history of the Ruthenians in the States has shown their great importance.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

The Fullness of Sacrifice : an Essay in Reconciliation. By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D., sometime bishop of Lincoln. (London : S.P.C.K.) Third edition, 1946. 15s.

This work embodies the conclusions of a life-long study of the Mystery of the Holy Eucharist on the part of a distinguished scholar of the Church of England. He believes that the controversies on this vital theme which still agitate certain portions of Christendom are the result of mistaken notions about the technicalities involved, which have led to a narrow and ill-balanced view of the whole field. He hopes that the wider and fuller conception of Sacrifice which his pages supply may help to bring about greater unanimity concerning an institution intended, by its very nature, to be a bond of union and peace among Christians. The essay displays much technical knowledge gathered from wide reading and the careful study of original sources.

The author's insistence on the primary importance of consulting Jewish origins is excellent, as is also his vindication of the true sacrificial character of the *incruenta* of the Old Testament. He attributes the greatest importance to the elements of praise and thanksgiving in sacrifice, and deprecates over-insistence on the destruction of the victim. He regards some of the modern attempts to discover "destruction" in the Eucharistic Sacrifice as futile and unnecessary : in particular he rejects the argument which would find a sacrificial connotation in the "Action" implied in our Lord's words : "Do this in memory of me." Quite rightly he finds a truer

sacrificial reference in the expression "My Blood of the New Covenant," for it is historically certain that the blood which sealed a covenant required to be sacrificial. Lastly, he deals at length with the sacrificial meal, though with some exaggeration as to its indispensability. We may add, that the writer's standpoint throughout is that of a moderate English Churchman; he does not seem to admit the Real Presence, yet he professes to recognize the full sacrificial character of the Eucharistic Offering.

The chief defect in the argument of the book is its lack of clear definition, with the inevitable result of vagueness in the employment of technical terms. This is the more surprising, since the essay is put forth as a protest against inaccurate terminology. Thus, never once throughout the work do we find an essential definition of sacrifice. The laboured descriptive definition on pp. 11-13 is both too long and too wide. The type chosen in illustration is the fully-developed sacrifice of the Temple, in which six different elements are distinguished. Yet, it is certain that not all of these were equally essential: some, quite obviously, were accidental. Thus the separate offering or sprinkling of the blood upon the altar was evidently a later elaboration, for in the earlier sacrifices of the patriarchs, the only offering of the blood that we know of, was the actual blood-shedding of the victim under the knife of the offerer. So, too, with the imposition of hands—it was clearly a ceremonial accretion, and therefore accidental. Through a similar confusion, the writer expresses his surprise that the Council of Trent, in speaking of the Eucharist, says nothing about the glorified life of Christ in heaven, which he considers of the first importance. But the Council is speaking of the formal sacrifice, of which the glorified life of Christ is in no sense a formal part: it is the effect and consequence of that sacrifice. The formal element in any sacrifice is the action of the offerer effecting a transformation of the victim, and such an action is of its nature, transient, nor can it be formally perpetuated. Certainly, Christ's glorified life and eternal intercession for us in heaven *virtually* perpetuate His earthly sacrifice, but if we choose to call this virtual permanence a "Sacrifice," we are using the term analogously, not properly: the only "true and proper sacrifice" is that offered on earth, for in heaven neither sacrifice nor sacrament are needed. Still more erroneous is the assertion that, according to Catholic Theology, Christ's Body in the Eucharist is His dead Body. This is to mis-

understand the theologians' language: Catholic Theology has ever taught that the Body in the Eucharist is the living Body of Christ, and consequently His glorified Body, exactly as it exists in heaven; but it also teaches that what is directly *represented* in the Eucharist is the Death of Christ, indirectly connoting His glorification. The reason and justification of this difference is, that for men still on earth, and subject to suffering and death, the memory of Christ's Passion is more consonant with their condition, and more helpful to their moral sense, than the contemplation of His glory, supposing always that the mutual relation of the two states is borne in mind. Nor do the different attitudes of Eastern and Western Christendom in this respect imply profound doctrinal divergences: it is merely a matter of difference of emphasis.

The author speaks forcibly on the subject of immolation, condemning the view which identifies immolation with death. In part, he is right, for both philology and history show that the primary meaning, of "immolation" is "consecration," not "death." Nevertheless, when the victim was a living thing, its death was always considered an essential part of its immolation, not, indeed, death for its own sake, but as representing the transition to a higher life. Death was the material element, consecration the formal element in immolation. In the case of an inanimate victim, e.g., bread or wine, immolation meant nothing more than consecration, i.e. that complete hallowing whereby a thing was removed from profane use, and became the exclusive possession of God. Thus it is that, in the Eucharistic Offering or Mass, there is no death of any kind, but there is a true immolation because there is a true consecration; Christ does not die, but He is none the less truly immolated; at the same time, this bloodless immolation is a figure of His death on the Cross.

These considerations point to a difficulty in Dr. Hicks' theory, which is nowhere adequately answered in the essay. He asserts with emphasis that the Eucharistic Offering is a full, true and proper sacrifice, yet he does not appear to admit the Real Presence (see pp. 340, 346, 347). But in that case the offering would be reduced to a mere bread-and-wine sacrifice, which contradicts St. Paul's teaching that, in the New Dispensation, there can be only one sacrifice, that in which Christ Himself is the Victim. If it be urged in reply, that the bread and wine are symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, we answer that, in that case, the term "sacrifice" is being used in an analogous sense, not in its proper sense, and, consequently, the offering is not a "true and proper sacrifice"

The essay contains an eloquent plea for a fuller understanding and appreciation of the Sacrificial Meal, and with most of what is said we can heartily agree. Yet here, again, there is a lack of clearness: for the writer confuses essential parts with integral parts. The Sacred Meal is, indeed, an integral part of the Sacrifice, but it cannot be an essential constituent part. The proof of this is, that the meal supposes the food to be already sanctified, i.e., sacrificed: therefore the meal cannot be a constituent part of the essence of the sacrifice, any more than an effect can be a constituent part of its own cause.

In view of the above criticisms, it is difficult for us to share the learned author's sanguine hopes that his essay will make for greater unanimity in Eucharistic doctrine and practice, a "reconciliation" between the different schools of thought. He can scarcely have hoped to influence his Catholic readers. How far members of his own communion will subscribe to his thesis, we cannot say. But the perusal of his volume must bring home forcibly to every unprejudiced mind the impossibility of doctrinal unity in circles where private judgment is the final arbiter.

DOM ANTHONY FLANNERY.

Catholicity. A Study in the conflict of Christian Traditions in the West, being a Report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. Dacre Press, 1947. Pp. 56. 2s. 6d.

This is the work of fourteen Anglican theologians viewing the conflict of the Christian Traditions in the West from inside that same conflict. They are both members of the Reformed Tradition and yet of the Catholic Revival and are out to see if they can call a halt to the conflict, though it has gone very far.

The table of contents shows the depth of the study.

"The Primitive Unity"; this is studied in its "wholeness," first in the New Testament with its roots in the Old Testament, and then in its manifestation of both in the Church. This "wholeness" is further considered with its inevitable tensions that in later history led to disastrous fissures.

"The Background of the Western Schisms,"—this is an invaluable survey of Christendom already split into East and West, and thus it confronts the sixteenth century with a defective tradition. Then follows the main part of the report, some twenty pages, on "Orthodox Protestantism," "The Renaissance and Liberalism" and "The Post-Trentine Papal Communion."

In the first the positive truths both of Luther's and Calvin's doctrines are dealt with. The two radical errors of the Reformation Protestantism are considered, viz, the dissociation of justification from the doctrine of creation and also from that of sanctification. And lastly the differences of teaching of Luther and Calvin on the Church are given.

The second factor of the division in Western Christianity since the sixteenth century is described as Renaissance in the earlier stages and Liberalism in the later.

We are given, in eight pages, an historical summary of post-Tredentine Catholicism.

There are two other chapters: "Fragmentation and Synthesis": the following is important, "The true way of synthesis is not to take our contemporary systems or 'isms' or Church traditions and try to piece them together, either as a whole or in selected items, but rather to go behind our contemporary systems and strive for the recovery of the fullness of Tradition within the thought and worship and order and life of each of the sundered portions of Christendom."

And the last on "The Anglican Communion." Here the last paragraph in the book is worth quoting and stressing:—"It is by a principle of constancy in Scriptures, Creeds, Sacraments and Apostolic Succession, that the Anglican Communion, for all the diversity within it, remains one. If this principle may be called, at the lowest, the historical condition of our unity in the Anglican Communion, we believe it to be at the highest the precondition of the task of theological synthesis to which the Anglican Communion is, in the Divine Providence, called."

It seems to us that the author's of this report are in danger of forgetting that the Church of God must be alive with the same spirit now as she was in the days of her beginning!

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Introductio in liturgiam Orientalem. By Alphonsus Raes, S.J. 1947, Rome, Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies. Pp. 288.

It will be recalled that Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Rerum Orientalium* of 8th September 1928, suggested that in every theological seminary the professors of history, liturgy and canon law should explain at least some elements of the analogous oriental sciences to their students, and the following year, on 29th August the Sacred Congregation of Studies

gave orders that this should be done and in particular that "In Liturgia haud minus accurata diligentia quam veneratione et observantia rituum catholicorum diversitas explanetur."

But the almost complete non-existence of school manuals dealing with this subject made the carrying out of these instructions very difficult. It is true that many books had been written about Eastern rites, and we in England were perhaps better supplied with these than were most countries, with the works of Brightman, Neale, Fortescue, Attwater and others, but we had nothing in the way of a school text. Now Father J. M. Hanssens, with his *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, and more recently Father Alphonsus Raes have to a great extent supplied this defect. We are obliged to say "to a great extent" and not "completely," specially in regard to the book we are reviewing, because as the author says, it is not really a "manual of Eastern liturgy." It is rather a series of essays or lessons on various subjects, each one very complete in itself and highly interesting, though we must confess the matter is set forth in a way, which, in spite of the admirable "tables," would render it extremely difficult for a student to memorize for an examination.

First we have a chapter on the origin and division of the various Eastern rites. Then comes a description of the various parts of an Eastern church, but, curiously enough, no description, beyond a mere mention, of the eikonastasis, of the altar or of the baptismal font. On page 39 is discussed the very interesting question of the desirability of veiling the mysteries. There follows a short history of the evolution of the various rites and then a most ingenious comparison of the eucharistic liturgy of the eight Eastern rites, taken stage by stage, each stage being illustrated with a most valuable synoptic table.

The mass of the Presanctified is not described, nor are other particular rites, which are performed on various days in the ecclesiastical year. In fact the liturgical calendars themselves are not treated of in this book.

Very interesting, as a proof of the anxiety of the Holy See to preserve the Eastern rites intact, is the information given in a note on page 77 to the effect that both in the Malankarese and Ethiopian liturgies the addition of the *trisagion* of the words "who wast crucified for us" is maintained. These words are considered heretical by the Orthodox, but it is evident that there is no Monophysite error in them, if the *trisagion* is addressed to Christ.

The ceremonies of Christian initiation, comprising the administration of the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and first communion, are also most fully dealt with in the same way, so too the sacrament of matrimony, but penance, holy anointing, funeral rites, ordination, monastic profession and the consecration of churches are wholly passed over.

Of the Divine Office only the hour of vespers is dealt with in detail, though we are told what hours compose the Divine Office in all the rites. In practice the morning office, or *orthros*, is of equal importance with vespers. In fact this office is celebrated in some churches, where vespers are not. The assertion made on page 19 that at the end of the second century the canonical hours did not exist, would be contested by some liturgists, at any rate as regards certain of the hours.

The question of the languages used in the celebration of Eastern liturgies is very completely treated. There is no mention of the French language, but perhaps that is now only used by Orthodox of the Latin rite.

In the next chapter on vestments the author limits himself to the strictly liturgical ones, not mentioning even the episcopal *mandyas*, which corresponds to our cappa magna. Nor does he describe the *epigonation* or the small *omophorion*.

It is strange too that in this book there should be no description of the sacred vessels and instruments, of the liturgical books or even of the eikons, which play so an important a part in Eastern worship.

An appendix deals with the chant. This is written in French. We are not told why, but perhaps it is on account of the difficulty of turning such technical language into Latin. The description is limited to the liturgical chant of the Byzantine rite, but gives details of its variations among the various peoples who follow this rite.

In conclusion we would say that the excellency and the thoroughness of the way in which the subjects treated are dealt with in this book, make us ardently desire that Father Raes should as soon as possible give us a really comprehensive, though not necessarily so detailed, manual of Eastern liturgy.

A.

La Liturgie de Saint Jacques. Edition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine. By B. G. Mercier. Firmin-Didot et Cie, Paris, 1946 Pp. 141. (tom. XXVI-fasc. 2 of the *Patrologia Orientalis* ed. by R. Graffin.)

The Anaphora falsely attributed to St. James, first bishop of Jerusalem, and probably arranged in the fourth or fifth cen-

turies, was in use before 692. It spread throughout Palestine and in Arabia, Syria, Armenia, Georgia, Greece, Ethiopia, and even in the Slav countries. Owing to the decline of the see of Jerusalem, to the growing importance of Constantinople and to the byzantinization of Antioch, the liturgy of St. James gave way before the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Since the twelfth century it has ceased to be celebrated in the Orthodox Churches (except in the island of Zante and as an episcopal function in the city of Jerusalem), but it has remained in use among the Syriac so-called Monophysite Churches as well as among the Roman Catholics of the Syrian rite.¹

It is to this liturgy that the famous *Catecheses* attributed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century), but probably composed by his successor John, refer. Certain of the prayers of the Anaphora of St. James, e.g., those for Christians sentenced to prison or exile, take us back to the times of persecution, but others, e.g., for the most pious Emperors, suggest a later date and there are unmistakable traces of the dogmatic developments of the fourth century. The author seems to know well not only the New Testament, including the epistle to the Hebrews, but the rules of rhetoric of the second school of sophists.

Dom Mercier is a monk of the Benedictine Priory of Amay-Chevetogne. He does not give us a general study of the liturgy of St. James, but a critical edition of its Greek text. Besides the Greek text of this liturgy there are also Syriac and Armenian recensions which are outside Dom Mercier's subject. Moreover his edition uses only a part of the extant Greek MSS, the most ancient MSS go back to the eighth and ninth centuries. Therefore we are still far from a complete comparative edition of the text of St. James. Nevertheless the MSS used by Dom Mercier, representing three states of the text in succession are excellent, and this last edition, however limited in its scope, deserves a high appreciation.

After three preliminary chapters on the history of the text, its recensions and tradition, Dom Mercier gives a Greek text with an *apparatus criticus* and a Latin translation. He considers the MS. *Vaticanus gr.* 2282 (ninth century) as the best, although it contains errors and gaps. An appendix gives the critical recension of several prayers before and after communion. Three useful tables (biblical quotations, Greek names of persons, and contents) complete the book. From the standpoint of textual criticism the discussions,

¹ The reviewer is an Orthodox priest.

methods and results conform to the most exacting standard. The Latin translation is founded upon the previous one by Jean de Saint-Andrè (1560), but revised so as to get greater accuracy. We are not sure that δέομεθά is best translated by *rogamus*: the Latin *petitio* has the same official and juridical implications as the Byzantine δέησις. The translation of ἀναπέμπομεν by *mittimus* misses the ideas not only of "sending upwards," but of "sending back," the "glory" (in the biblical sense of luminous manifestation) which God has sent down "upon us."

The bibliography might have been more complete. We are surprised not to find any mention of Dom R. H. Connolly or H. W. Codrington. Again as Dom Mercier has a table of Greek personal names, why not also of non-Greek names? Such a table is a necessity of any modern scholarly work.

Until the complete comparative edition of the Liturgy of St. James appears Dom Mercier's partial edition will render a great service. This piece of genuine scholarship is worthy both of the "Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes" of Paris, for a diploma for which it was written, and of the well-known *Patrologia Orientalia* of which it is a part.

L.G.

Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders. Edited by E. R. Hardy, Jr. Morehouse Gorham Co. \$1.

The editor in his introduction says that the purpose of this collection of documents is to make accessible the official synodical statements on Anglican Orders of those Eastern Orthodox Churches which have passed judgment on the subject. This purpose he has certainly achieved.

Mr Hardy gives the statements of the Churches of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Alexandria, Rumania and Greece. Also the reports of the Orthodox-Anglican Theological Conferences: Lambeth, 1930; the Joint Doctrinal Commission, London, 1931 and Bucharest, 1935. In addition to these he gives two theses on the subject by learned Orthodox divines, Professor P. Komnenos and Patriarch (then Metropolitan) Sergius of Moscow. There is also a useful bibliography. The last two documents are of importance as giving the theological principles on which the Orthodox judge of Orders outside the Orthodox Church. The Church of Greece has not explicitly accepted Anglican Orders as the other Churches above mentioned have.

B.W.

Lettres a Olympias. By St. John Chrysostom. Introduction and translation by Anne-Marie Malingrey. Collection "Sources Chretiennes" (Editions du Cerf, Paris). 1947.

Litterae familiares! There are people who think that human friendship is incompatible with loving God. The great saints were not quite so exacting. Who will fail to perceive the charm and goodness of *this* friendship?

Then there are people who are inclined to oppose the practical Hebrews to the speculative Greeks. Let them read the life of Olympias and the spiritual letters of St. John Chrysostom.

The problem of suffering, as treated of here, is interesting, and in some ways, surprising: no mention of suffering for the love of God, union with Christ in His Passion, or reparation for the sins of men; but simply that God wisely abides His time, before He manifests His power, and avenges the oppression of the just. An Old Testament theme perhaps? The Fathers of the Church knew their *Law, Prophets and Writings*.

One cannot but approve of these popular (but scholarly) editions of the Fathers, especially as the original text is given in full—thereby disclaiming any finality on the part of the translation. Actually this translation is pleasing and carefully done. It tells us what St. John Chrysostom meant. Does it always tell us what he said?

G.R.

Les Ordinations chez les Melkites. Par le Père Blondeel, P.B. Pp. 39. At St. Anne's Seminary, Jerusalem. n.p.

Father Blondeel has produced a very useful manual giving a sort of bird's-eye view of the Byzantine rites of ordination according to the usages of the Melkites. It is arranged in such a way as to bring out the salient points of each, and the text of certain important prayers is included, printed in parallel French, Greek and Arabic. The work is not simply of liturgical interest, for in an introduction and at each stage of the services Father Blondeel gives short expository and ascetical quotations, notably from Chrysostom's *On the Priesthood* and from the *Treatise on Holy Orders* of Simeon of Thessalonika.

Each ordination according to Eastern enumeration is included—lectorate, subdiaconate, diaconate, priesthood—except the episcopate, the fullness of the priesthood itself. It is difficult to account for this omission from an otherwise excellent booklet.

D.A.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Hodder & Stoughton: *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by K. E. Kirk (reprint 1947).
- S.P.C.K.: *The Anglicanism of William Laud*. By E. C. E. Bourne. *The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement*. By H. R. T. Brandreth. *The Byzantine Patriarchate*. By G. Every. *Heritage of Byzantium*. By Marcu Beza.
- Editions Charles Beyaert, Bruges: *Aux Sources de la Spiritualité de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* and *Guillaume de Saint-Thierry*. By Dom J. M. Dechanet. *Le Miroir de la Foi*. By Guillaume de Saint-Thierry.
- Les Edition du Cerf. Paris: *La Theologie de l'Eglise de Saint Irénée au Concile de Nicée*. By G. Bardy.
- Officium libri Catholici, Rome: *Pontificia nipponica*. By Leo Magnino.
- Sheed & Ward: *The Redemption of Israel*. By John Friedman
- Imprimerie de l'Institut Francias D'Archéologie Orientale, Cairo: *The Baptismal Rite of the Coptic Church*. O.H.E. KHS-Burmester.
- Byzantine Institute Inc., Boston, U.S.A.: *Eastern Elements* (Hugh Rees, London, S.W.1.) *In Western Chant*. By Egon Wellesz.
- Declan & McMullen Co., U.S.A.: *Windows Westward: Rome, Russia and Reunion*. By Very Rev. Dr. S. C. Gulovich.

REVIEWS

- The Changing World*. The Harville Press, London.
- The Third Hour*. No. III, 1947. New York.
- Studia Anselmiana*. No. 18-19. Rome, 1947.